श्रीमदप्पयदीक्षित-

विरचिता

चित्रमीमांसा

॥ श्रीः ॥

श्रीमदप्पयदीक्षितविरचिता

# चित्रमीमांसा

अभिवन्द्यचन्द्रशेखरमाद्यं गौरीसखं परं ज्योतिः ।
वितनोमि विपुलविषयां विशदार्थामर्थचित्रमीमांसाम् ॥

त्रिविधं तावत्काव्यम् । ध्वनि-गुणीभूतव्यंगय-चित्रभेदात् ।

यत्र वाच्यातिशायि व्यंगयं स ध्वनिः ।

यथा---

'स्थिताः क्षणं पक्ष्मसु ताडिताधराः पयोधरोत्सेधनिपातचूर्णिताः ।
वलीषु तस्याः स्खलिताः प्रपेदिरे चिरेण[1] नाभिं प्रथमोदबिन्दवः[2] ॥'

अत्र तपस्यन्त्या[3] देव्या देहोपरि निपततां प्रथमवृष्टिबिन्दूनां क्रियास्वभाववर्णनेन देव्याः[4] समाध्युचितावस्थानाभिव्यक्तिद्वारा चिरनिदाघतप्त[5]देहोपरि निपतनेन सुखपारवश्यसंभ्रमहेतौ प्रथमवृष्टावप्यविहता समाध्यवस्था व्यज्यते । तथा हि --

'नासाग्रन्यस्तनयनः संवृतास्यः[6] सुनिश्चलः ।
ध्यायीत मनसा देवमुरो विष्टभ्य चाग्रतः ॥'

इति समाधिमतामवस्थानमाहुः[7] । तत्र पक्ष्मसु स्थिता इत्यनेन नासाग्रन्यस्तनयनतारूपमर्धनिमीलनं[8] व्यज्यते । सर्वथोन्मीलने पक्ष्मणामूर्ध्वाग्रत्वेन सर्वथा[9] निमीलने[10] तेषामधोग्रत्वेन च तेषु जलबिन्दूनां स्थित्यसंभवात् । पक्ष्मभ्यश्च्युतानां तेषामास्याप्रवेशेना[11]धरोष्ठे निपत्य ततश्च्युतिकथनेन संवृतास्यत्वं व्यज्यते । ततश्च्युतानां तेषां[12] स्तनोत्सेधनिपतनादिवर्णनेन उरोविष्टम्भः । अलसवदवनतावस्थाने[13]

---

१- चिणा-ख २- बिन्दवः-ख ३- तपस्यता (?)- क ४- देव्या-क,घ, ५- चितुनिदाघ (?)--क -६- सवतस्या: (?)-ख ७- समवताम्-ख ८- निमीलनं (?) -क
९- सर्वता-ख १०- निमिलने-क -निमीलनेन-ख ११- आस्येऽप्रवे--ख -आस्यप्रवेशेन-ग १२- तेषां- इति ख पुस्तके नास्ति १३- अलसवदनतावस्थाने-ख,ग

हि स्तनयोरन्त: संकुचिताकारतया तदुत्सेधयोस्तेषां पतनं न स्यात् । कथंचित्तयो: पतित्वा वलित्रयं प्राप्तानामपि वलीषु तिर्यगेव गमनं स्यात्, न नाभिदेशप्राप्ति: । नाभौ च संवृतायां प्रवेशोन स्यात् । पक्ष्माधरादिपतन-क्रमकथनेन च निश्चलत्वं व्यज्यते । मुखादि चलने सति पक्ष्मपतितानां तेषामधरपयो-धरादिक्रमेण पतनासंभवात् । किं चैभिरेव विशेषणैर्देव्या लोकोत्तर[1] सौन्दर्यमभिव्यज्यते । स्थिता इत्यनेन पक्ष्मणामविरलताया: क्षणमित्यनेन तेषां मसृणताया: पक्ष्मपतनशिथिलवेगैरुदबिन्दुभिस्ताडनोक्त्याधरस्याति-सौकुमार्यस्य पक्ष्माधरपतनादिभि:[2] शिथिलवेगानां[3] तेषां स्तनोत्सेधे[4] चूर्णीभाववर्णनेन तयोरतिकाठिन्यस्य, उरोविष्टम्भेऽपि वलीषु तेषां स्खलनोक्त्या वलीनां विस्पष्टताया: सर्वबिन्दूनां नाभावेव प्रवेशकथनेन नाभेरतिगम्भीरतायाश्चाभिव्यंजनात् । एवं च[5] वाच्यातिशायि व्यं-ग्यमत्रेति ध्वनेरुदाहरणमिदम्[6] । यथा वा[7]---

"नि:शेषच्युतचन्दनं स्तनतटं निर्मृष्टरागोऽधरो
नेत्रे[8] दूरमनञ्जने पुलकिता तन्वी तवेयं तनु: ।
मिथ्यावादिनि दूति बान्धवजनस्याज्ञातपीडागमा
वापीं स्नातुमितो गतासि न पुनस्तस्याधमस्यान्तिकम् ।।"

अत्र वापीं स्नातुं गतासि न तु तत्सकाशमिति वाक्यार्थे स्थिते तत्स-काशमेव रन्तुं गतासीत्यधमपदेन प्राधान्येन व्यज्यते । तथाहि :-अधमत्व-मपकृष्टत्वं तच्च जात्या कर्मणा वा भवति । तत्र जात्यापकर्षं नोत्तमना-यिका नायकस्य वदति । नापि सापराधपर्यवसायिदूतीसंभोगादिहीनक-र्मातिरिक्तेन कर्मणा । तादृशं च दूतीसंभोगात्[9]प्राचीनं सर्वं सोढमेवेति नी-द्घाटनार्हम् । अन्यथा स्वयं[10] दूतीसंप्रेषणानुपपत्ते: । तदनन्तरं च सप्रेषित-दूतीसंभोगरूपमेव स्वयं संनिहितचिह्नैर्ज्ञातुं शक्यं हीनकर्म संभवतीति तत्पर्यवसायिनाधमपदेन तस्यान्तिकमेव रन्तुं गतासीति व्यज्यते । नि:शेष-च्युतचन्दनं स्तनतटमित्यादीनि वाक्यानि[11] संभोगचिह्नोद्घाटनेन तत्र साहा-[12]यकमाचरन्ति । कथम् ? नि:शेषच्युतचन्दनं स्तनतटमित्यत्र तावद्वापीं स्ना-तुमितो गतासीति वाच्यार्थमुपपादयितुमिवो[13]त्तरीयकर्षणेन[14] चन्दनच्यु-तिरित्यन्यथासिद्धिपरिहाराय नि:शेषविशेषणं[15] कृतम् । ततश्चन्दनच्युते:

---

१- अतिसौन्दर्यम्- ख- सौन्दर्यमपि-क,ग-२- पक्ष्माधरपतनात्-क,ग-३-अतिशि-थिलवेगानां-क,ग-४- स्तनोत्सेधचूर्णी--क,ग-५ च-गपुस्तकेनास्ति, ६-ध्वानरुदाहरणमिदं-ख-७ वा-ख-पुस्तकेनास्ति ८- नेत्र-ख-९-दूती- संप्रेषणात् ख- १० स्वयं-ख पुस्तकेनास्ति ११- वाच्यानिन्य १२- साहाय्यमाच--ग-१३-उपपादयितुमिव -क,ख-ग १४- उत्तरीयधर्षणेण-क,ग-उत्तरीकर्षणेण घ-१५-नि:शेषणं-ख

स्नानसाधारण्यव्यावर्तनेन संभोगचिन्होद्घाटनाय तद्ग्रहणम् । स्नाने हि स-[1]
र्वत्र चन्दनच्युति: स्यात्, तव तु स्तनयोस्तटे उपरिभाग एव दृश्यते, इय-
माश्लेषकृतैवेति[2] । तथा निर्मृष्टरागोऽधर इत्यत्र ताम्बूलग्रहणविलम्बात्प्रा-
चीनरागस्य किंचिन्मृष्टतेत्यन्यथासिद्धिपरिहाराय निर्मृष्टराग[3] इति[4] रागस्य
नि:शेषमृष्टतोक्ता । पुन: स्नानसाधारण्यव्यावर्तनेन संभोगचिन्होद्घाटनाया-
धर इति विशिष्य ग्रहणम् । उत्तरोष्ठे सरागेऽधरोष्ठमात्रस्य निर्मृष्टरागता
चुम्बनकृतेवेति । नेत्रे दूरमनञ्जने इत्यत्र प्रातर्दत्तमंजनं कालविलम्बेन[5] किं-
चिद्विलुप्तमित्यन्यथासिद्धिपरिहाराय दूरमित्युक्तम् । दूरमत्यर्थमित्यापात-[6]
तोऽर्थ: । कालत: स्नानेन वा सर्वतोऽञ्जनलोप: स्यात्, तव तु लोचनयो:
क्वचित्प्रान्त एवानञ्जनत्वमिदं[7] चुम्बनकृतमेवेति । पुलकिता तन्वी तवेयं
तनुरित्यत्रापाततस्तन्वीति सहजतानवकीर्तनेन पुलकितेति स्नानचिह्नोप-
न्यास: पुलकितापि तन्वी वर्तते इति हृदि स्थितोऽन्वय: तेन च स्नानेन
पुलकिता तनु: किंचिदुच्छ्वसिता भवति, इयं तु न तथेति रति[8]क्लेशजनिता-
वेव तानवपुलकोद्गमाविति मर्मोद्घाटनम् । एवमेभिर्वाक्यैरुपस्कृतेनाधमपदेन
तस्यान्तिकमेव रन्तुं गतासीति व्यज्यमाने प्राग्वाच्यार्थदशायां[9] बापीं
स्नातुं गतासीत्येतदनुगुणार्थतयान्वितं[10] मिथ्यावादिनीति[11] संबोधनमपि[12] व्यं-
ग्यानुगुणं स्वार्थे पर्यवस्यति । ततश्च न्यग्भावितवाच्यमस्यापि व्यंग्यं
वाच्यातिशायीति[13] इदमपि ध्वनेरुदाहरणम् ।

यत्र व्यंग्यं वाच्यानतिशायि तद्गुणीभूतव्यंग्यम् ।

यथा-

गच्छाम्यच्युत दर्शनेन भवत: किं तृप्तिरुत्पद्यते
किंत्वेवं विजनस्थयोर्हतजन: संभावयत्यन्यथा ।
इत्यामन्त्रणभंगिसूचितवृथावस्थानखेदालसा-
माश्लिष्यन्पुलकोत्कराञ्चिततनुं गोपीं हरि: पातु व: ।।

अत्र गच्छाम्युच्युतेत्याद्यामन्त्रणेन त्वया रन्तुमेतावत्कालं स्थितं तन्न[14]

१- समग्रचन्दन- ख -२- आश्लेषणतैवेति- क,ध -३- निमृष्ट-ख-४- इति
रागस्य-ख- पुस्तकेनास्ति ५- काले-ख- विलम्बेन इतिचनास्ति ६-
दूरमित्यर्थम्-क- ७- अनञ्जनत्वमिति-क,ग-८- रति- ख-पुस्तकेनास्ति
९- वाच्यार्थतादशया-ग, घ-१०- गतासीतिये (?) क- ११-- वादिनीत्यादि-
क,ख,ग १२- अपि-क-ख-ग पुस्तकेषु नास्ति १३- बाच्य- ख पुस्तकेनास्ति,
वाच्यादति-- ग- १४- न तल्लब्धम्-क,खग.

लब्धमिति व्यंग्यम् । तत्तु इत्यामन्त्रणभंगिसूचितवृथावस्थानखेदालसामि-
त्यैतद्वाच्यस्य सिद्धिं करोतीति तदंगत्वान्न वाच्यातिशायि । अतो गुणी-
भूतव्यंग्यमिदम् । यथा वा--

प्रहरविरतौ[1] मध्ये वाह्नस्ततो[2]ऽपि परेऽथवा
किमुत सकले याते वाह्नि प्रिय त्वमिहैष्यसि[3] ।
इति दिनशतप्राप्यं देशं प्रियस्य यियासतो
हरति गमनं बालालापैः[4] सबाष्प[5]गलज्जलैः[6] ॥

अत्र सकलमहः परमावधिः । ततः परं प्राणान्धारयितुं न शक्नोमीति
व्यंग्यं प्रियगमननिवारणरूपस्य वाच्यस्य सिद्धिं करोतीति तदंगत्वाद्वा-
च्यानतिशायि । अतःइदमपि गुणीभूतव्यंग्यम् ।

यदव्यंग्यमपि चारु तच्चित्रम् ।

तत्त्रिविधम्-- शब्दचित्रमर्थचित्रमुभयचित्रमिति । शब्दचित्रं यथा--

नवपलाशपलाशवनं पुरः स्फुटपराग[7]परागतपंकजम् ।
मृदुलतान्तलतान्तमलोकयत्[8]स सुरभिं सुरभिं सुमनोभरैः ॥

अर्थचित्रं यथा--

स च्छिन्नमूलः क्षतजेन रेणुस्तस्योपरिष्टात्पवनावधूतः ।
अंगारशेषस्य हुताशनस्य पूर्वोत्थितो धूम इवाबभासे[9] ॥

उभयचित्रं यथा--

वराहः कल्याणं वितरतु स वः कल्पविरमे
विनिर्धुन्वन्[10]नोदन्वतमुदकमुर्वीमुदवहत् ।
खुराघातत्रुट्यत्कुलशिखरिकूटप्रविलुठ-
च्छिलाकोटि[11]स्फोटस्फुट[12]घटितमंगल्य[13]पटहः ॥

तदेवं त्रिविधे काव्ये[14] ध्वनिगुणीभूतव्यंग्ययोरन्यत्रास्माभिः प्रपंचःकृतः । श-
ब्दचित्रस्य प्रायोनीरसत्वान्नात्यन्तं तदाद्रियन्ते कवयः न वा तत्र विचारणी-
यमतीवोपलभ्यत इति शब्दचित्रांशमपहायार्थचित्रमीमांसा[15] प्रसन्नविस्तीर्णा
प्रस्तूयते ।

---

१- प्रहरविहृतौ- ख-२- मध्येऽप्यह्नस्तु ख-३- मिहेष्यसि-ग-
४- बालावाक्यैः ख- ५- स- ख- पुस्तकेनास्ति ६- बाष्पकलमलैः(?) ख-
७- फुटपराग-ग- ८- अलोकयन्-क-६- वभाषे - ग घ १०-विनिर्धु-क,ग०
११- कोटी ख- १२- स्फुट - ख १३- मांगल्य-क,ग १४- काव्ये घ-
पुस्तकेनास्ति १५- अर्थचित्रेमीमांसा- क,ग

चिन्त्येऽत्र चित्रवर्गे[1] प्रदर्श्ययोर्लक्ष्यलक्षणयो: ।
प्राचीनानामेव श्लोका: प्रायेण लिख्यन्ते ।।
इति चित्रमीमांसायां ग्रन्थारम्भप्रकरणम् ।

---

उपमैका शैलूषी संप्राप्ता चित्रभूमिकाभेदान् ।
रञ्जयति काव्यरंगे नृत्यन्ती तद्विदां चेत: ।।

चन्द्र इव मुखमिति सादृश्यवर्णनं तावदुपमा । सैवोक्तिभंगीभेदेना-नेकालंकारभावं भजते । तथा हि,(1) 'चन्द्र इव मुखं मुखमिव चन्द्र:' इत्युपमेयोपमा । 'मुखं मुखमिव' इत्यनन्वय:[2] । 'मुखमिव चन्द्र' इति प्रतीपम् । 'चन्द्रं दृष्ट्वा मुखं स्मरामि' इति स्मरणम् । 'मुखमेव चन्द्र:' इति रूपकम् । 'मुखचन्द्रेण ताप: शाम्यति' इति परिणाम: । 'किमिदं मुख-[3]मुताहो चन्द्र:' इति ससंदेह:[4] । 'चन्द्र इति चकोरास्त्वन्मुखमनुधावन्ति' इति भ्रान्तिमान् । 'चन्द्र इति चकोरा: कमलमिति चंचरीकास्त्वन्मुखे रज्यन्ति[5]' इत्युल्लेख: । 'चन्द्रोऽयं न मुखम्' इत्यपन्हव: । 'नूनं चन्द्र:' इत्युत्प्रेक्षा । 'चन्द्रोऽयम्' इत्यतिशयोक्ति: । 'मुखेन चन्द्रकमले निर्जिते' इति तुल्ययोगिता । 'निशि चन्द्रस्त्वन्मुखं च हृष्यति' इति दीपकम् । 'त्वन्मुख स्वाहं रज्यामि चन्द्र एव[6] चकोरो सज्जते[7]' इति प्रतिवस्तूपमा । 'दिवि चन्द्रो भुवि त्वन्मुखम्' इति दृष्टान्त: । 'मुखं चन्द्रश्रियं[8] विभर्ति' इति निदर्शना । 'निष्कलंकं[9] मुखं चन्द्रादतिरिच्यते' इति व्यतिरेक: । 'त्वन्मुखेन समं चन्द्रो निशासु हृष्यति' इति सहोक्ति: । 'मुखं नेत्राकंरुचिरं स्मितज्योत्स्नोपशोभितम्' इति समासोक्ति: । 'अनेन सदृशं वक्त्रं हरिणाङ्कितसक्तिना' इति श्लेष: । 'मुखस्य पुरतश्चन्द्रो निष्प्रभ:[10]' इत्यप्रस्तुतप्रशंसा । एवमुक्तानेकालंकारविवर्तवतीयमुपमा ।

तदिदं चित्रं विश्वं ब्रह्मज्ञानादिवोपमाज्ञानात् ।
ज्ञातं भवतीत्यादौ निरूप्यते निखिलभेदसहिता सा ।।

---

१- चित्रगर्वे-क- २- अन्वय: घ-३- किमुख-ख-४- संदेह: क-घ- ५- अनुरज्यन्ति -क, ग- ६- हि -इत्यधिकं-क,ख,ग-७- रज्यते-ग,घ- सज्जते-ख-८- चन्द्रश्रिय: -घ- ९- नि:कलंकं-क- १०- नि:प्रभ-क

अस्यास्तावदेवं लक्षणमाहु:-

उपमानोपमेयत्वयोग्ययोरर्थयोर्द्वयो: ।

हृद्यं साधर्म्यमुपमेत्युच्यते काव्यवेदिभि: ।।

कविसमयप्रसिद्ध्यनुरोधेनोपमानोपमेयत्वयोग्ययोरेव साधर्म्यमुपमा । नत्वतथाभूतयो:। अत एव 'कुमुदमिव मुखं प्रसन्नम्' इत्यादि[1] नोपमा । तथाभूतयोरपि वस्तुत्वद्रव्यत्वादिकृतमहृद्यं[2] साधर्म्यं न तथा । किंतु हृद्यमेव कान्तिमत्त्वादिकम् । सर्वोऽपि ह्यलंकार: कविसमयप्रसिद्ध्यनुरोधेन हृद्यतया काव्यशोभाकर एवालंकारतां भजते । अत: 'गोसदृशो गवय:' इति नोपमा । 'गौर्वाहीक' इति न रूपकम् । 'स्थाणुर्वा पुरुषो वा' इति न ससंदेह:[3] । 'इदं रजतम्' इति न भ्रान्तिमान् । 'नायं सर्प:' इति नापह्नुति: । 'पीनो देवदत्तो दिवा न भुङ्क्ते' इति न पर्यायोक्तम् । 'पर्वतो वह्निमान्' इति नानुमानम् । 'स देवदत्त:' इति न स्मरणम् । 'तस्थस्थमिषा तार्ततास:' इति न यथासंख्यम् । 'पुत्रेण सहागत: पिता[4]' इति न सहोक्ति: । 'तेन विना गत:' इति न विनोक्ति: 'श्वेतो धावति' इति न श्लेष: इत्याद्यूहनीयम् । अत्रेदं विचार्यते- द्वयोरिति विशेषणमिह किमर्थम् । स्वस्य स्वेनैव सार्धर्म्यवर्णनात्मकस्यानन्वयस्य व्युदासार्थमिति चेत्, एवमप्युपमानस्योपमेयत्वकल्पनात्मके प्रतीपे द्वयो: पर्यायेणोपमेयत्वकल्पनात्मिकायामुपमेयोपमायां[5] चातिव्याप्ति: । तयो: सादृश्यवर्णनसत्त्वादुपमात्वेन संग्राह्यत्वे[6] तथैवानन्वयोऽपि संग्राह्य: स्यादिति व्यर्थं द्वयोरिति पदम् । एतेन 'साधर्म्यमुपमा भेदे' - इति काव्यप्रकाशिकोक्त [redacted] लक्षणेऽनन्वयव्युदासाय कृतं भेदग्रहणमपि[7] प्रत्युक्तम् । नहि संभवत्साधर्म्यवर्णनं स्वोपमात्वम् । येन स्वस्य स्वेन साधर्म्यासंभवादनन्वयस्य[8] व्यवच्छेद्यत्वमितरयो: संग्राह्यत्वं च[9] स्यात् । तथात्वे 'हंसीव धवला कीर्ति: स्वर्गङ्गामवगाहते' इत्यादौ[10] कविकल्पितसाधर्म्योपमाया अनुपमात्वप्रसंगात् । किं च सत्यामप्युपमानोपमेयत्वयोग्यतायां सत्यपि हृद्यत्वे लिंगवचनभेदादिदुष्टायामुपमायां 'हंसीव

---

१- इत्यादिनोपमा-क,ख,ग-इत्यादिनोपमा-घ २- अहृद्यसाधर्म्यं-क,ग- ३- संदेह: क,ख,घ ४- पिता-खपुस्तके नास्ति ५- पर्यायेणोपमेयत्वकल्पनात्मिकाया-घ, पर्यायेणोपमानोपमेयत्व--क,ख,ग- ६- संग्राह्यत्वेन-ग- ७- भेदग्रहणमिति-क- ८- साधर्म्यासंभवात् ग-९- न-घ-१०- इत्यादे: क,ख,ग

धवलश्चन्द्र: सरसीवामलं[१] नभ:" इत्यादिरूपायामतिव्याप्ति: । उदाहरिष्यमाणे[२] चोपमाध्वनावतिव्याप्ति: । न हि सोऽप्यलंकार: । अलंकार्यत्वात् ब्राह्मणश्रमणन्यायेन तत्रालंकारध्वनिव्यपदेश इति सिद्धान्तात् । यदि च दृष्टादृष्टालंकार्यालंकारसाधारणोपमासामान्यलक्षणमिति नोक्तातिव्याप्तिस्तदोपमानोपमेयत्वयोग्ययोरिति दृष्टमिति च व्यर्थम् । कविसमयप्रसिद्धभावादि[३]दृष्टोपमाया अपि संग्राह्यत्वात्[य] । यत्तु विद्यानाथेन लक्षणमुक्तम्-

"स्वत: सिद्धेन भिन्नेन संमतेन च धर्मत: ।
साम्यमन्येन वर्ण्यस्य वाच्यं चेदेकदोपमा ।।" इति ।

अत्र स्वत:सिद्धेनेत्युत्प्रेक्षा[४] व्यावृत्ति: । तत्रोपमानस्य कविकल्पितत्वेन लोकसिद्धत्वाभावात् । भिन्नेनेत्यनन्वयव्यावृत्ति: । संमतेनेति सर्वविधदृष्टोपमाव्यावृत्ति: । कविसमयप्रसिद्ध्यभावेन लिंगवचनभेदादिना वा यद्यदसंमतं तस्य सर्वस्यापि संमतपदेन व्यावर्तनात् । धर्मत इति श्लेषव्यावृत्ति: । श्लेषे हि "सकलकलं पुरमेतज्जातं संप्रति सुधांशु[५]बिम्बमिव" इत्यादौ शब्दसाम्यमात्रमिवशब्देनोच्यते न गुणक्रियारूपधर्मसाम्यम्[६] । अन्येन वर्ण्यस्येत्यनेन प्रतीपव्यावृत्ति: । तत्र वर्ण्येन प्रकृतेन सह[७]ाप्रकृतस्य[८] सादृश्यवर्णनात् । एकदेत्यनेनोपमेयोपमा[९]व्यावृत्ति: । वाच्यमित्यनेन व्यंग्योपमा[१०]व्यावृत्ति: इति । तत्रोत्प्रेक्षाव्यावृत्त्यै स्वत:सिद्धेनेत्युक्तमयुक्तम्[११] । उत्प्रेक्षायामिवकारस्य विषयविषयिणोस्तादात्म्यादिसंभावनावाचकत्वेन तत्र साम्यस्यावाच्यतया[१२] तत एव तद्व्यावृत्ते: । उक्तं हि चक्रवर्तिना--

"यदायमुपमानांशो लोकत: सिद्धिमृच्छति ।
तदोपमैव येनेवशब्द: साधर्म्यसूचक: ।।
यदा पुनरयं लोकादसिद्ध: कविकल्पित: ।
तदोत्प्रेक्षैव येनेवशब्द:[१३] संभावनापर: ।।" इति ।

दृष्टं च लोके संभावनापरत्वमिवशब्दस्य । "दूरे तिष्ठन्देवदत्त इव भाति[१४]" इति । कथं च स्वत:सिद्धेनेत्यनेनो[१५]त्प्रेक्षाव्यावृत्ति: ।

---

१- सरसीवामलं-ग-२- च-ख- पुस्तके नास्ति ३- आदि-ग पुस्तकेनास्ति ४- इत्यनेन-इत्यधिकं गपुस्तके ५- सितांशु क-६- साधर्म्यम् क-७ सह-क पुस्तके नास्ति ८- अन्यस्य क- ९- उपमेयोपमाया- क, ग, १०- व्यंग्योपमाया क-११- अयुक्तम्-ख-पुस्तकेनास्ति, १२- वाच्यतया ख-१३- येनेकशब्द: ख- १४- आभाति क- १५- अनेन -क-ग-पुस्तकयोर्नास्ति ।

'न नित्यमस्मिन्परिपूर्णतेति त्यक्त्वा नभ:शाणितलावतीर्ण: ।

आनन्दयन्निन्दुरिवखधाम्ना विभाति लोके नवकाकतीन्द्र:[१] ।।'

इति तदीयोत्प्रेक्षोदाहरणस्योपमानस्य स्वत:सिद्धत्वात्[२] । इन्दु: शाणि तलावतीर्णत्वाकारेण कविकल्पित इति चेत्तर्हि ,

'चन्द्रबिम्बादिव विषं चन्दनादिव चानल: ।

परुषा वागितो वक्त्रादित्यसंभावितोपमा ।।'

इत्युक्तायामसंभावितोपमायामव्याप्ति:[३] । विषानलयो: स्वत:सिद्धत्वेऽपि चन्द्रचन्दनप्रभवत्वेन कविकल्पितत्वात् ।

'उभौ यदि व्योम्नि पृथक्प्रवाहावाकाशगंगापयस: पतेताम् ।

तेनोपमीयेत तमालनीलमामुक्तमुक्तालतमस्य वक्ष: ।।'

इति कविकल्पितोपमानायामुपमायां सर्वथैवाव्याप्ति: । भिन्नेनेत्यनन्वय-व्यावृत्त्यर्थमुपात्तमप्ययुक्तम्[४] ।

'अनन्तरत्नप्रभवस्य यस्य हिमं न सौभाग्यविलोपि जातम् ।

एको हि दोषो गुणसंनिपाते निमज्जतीन्दो: किरणेष्विवाङ्क: ।।'

इत्यस्यामुपपादकोपमायामव्याप्ते: । तत्रोपमेयदोष[५]गुणसामान्यान्तर्गतानामुपमानानां दोषगुण[६]विशेषाणां कलंककिरणानां तद्भिन्नत्वाभावात् । अथोपमेयतावच्छेदकभिन्नोपमानतावच्छेदकावच्छिन्नत्वमुपमानस्य तद्भिन्नत्वमेतदपि[७] न युक्तम् ।

'अनवरतकनकवितरणधृत जललवकरतरंगितार्थिततेः[८] ।

भणितिरिव मतिर्मतिरिव चेष्टाचेष्टेव कीर्तिरतिविमला ।।'

इति रशनोपमायामव्याप्ते: । मतित्वादुपमानतावच्छेदकानामुपमेयताव-च्छेदकभिन्नत्वाभावात्[९] । उपमेयोपमायामुपमानतावच्छेदकयोर्द्वयोरपि तद्भिन्नत्वाभावेनोक्तविशेषणेनैव तदव्यावृत्तिसिद्धया एकदेत्यस्य वैयर्थ्यापत्तेश्च ।

'रजोभि: स्यन्दनोद्धूतैर्गजैश्च घनसंनिभै: ।

भुवस्तलमिव[१०] व्योम कुर्वन्व्योमेव भूतलम् ।।'

---

१- नवकाकातीन्द्र: क-२-इन्दो: इत्यधिकं क-ख-ग पुस्तकेषु -३- इत्युक्तरूपायाम्, -क,ख-ग-४- मप्ययुक्तं (?) क, --युक्तमप्ययुक्तम् -ग- ५- दोष -क पुस्तके नास्ति ६- दोषागुण् -ख-७- अथोपमेयतावच्छेदकभिन्नत्वं उपमानभिन्नत्वं-क, अथोपमेयतावच्छेदकभिन्नत्वं तद्भिन्नत्व-ख-८- -तार्थितते: ख- ९- -च्छेदकावच्छिन्नत्वाभावात्-क,-- मुपमेयतावच्छेदक त्वाभावात्-ख- १०- नमस्तल -ख

इत्युपमेयोपमाप्रकरणोदाहरिष्यमाणपरस्परोपमायामव्याप्तेश्च । अथ सोपमेयतावच्छेदकभिन्नधर्मावच्छिन्नत्वमुपमानस्य तद्भिन्नत्वमिति विवक्षितमिदमपि न सम्यक् ।

उपाददे तस्य सहस्ररश्मिस्त्वष्ट्रा नवं निर्मितमातपत्रम् ।
स तुद्दुकूलादविदूरमौलिर्बभौ पतङ्गं इवोत्तमांगे ।।

द्वारं द्वारमटन्भिक्षुः शिक्षात्येवं न याचते ।
अदत्वा मादृशो मा भूर्दत्वा त्वं त्वादृशो भव ।।

इत्याद्यभिन्नधर्मिकोपमास्वव्याप्तेश्च । तत्र परमेश्वरत्वादेः सोपमेयतावच्छेदकस्यैवोपमानतावच्छेदकत्वात् । श्लेषव्यावृत्त्यर्थं धर्मत इति विशेषणमप्ययुक्तम् । तत्र न शब्दसाम्यमात्रमिवेनोच्यते किं तु गुणसाम्यमपीति तदव्याकृतेः । ननु पुरे सकलकलत्वं कलकलशब्दसाहित्यं सुधांशुबिम्बे कलासाकल्यमिति, नैकोऽनुगतो गुणो लभ्यते । मैवम् । श्लेषभित्तिकाभेदाध्यवसायमूलया भेदेऽभेद इत्येवंरूपयातिशयोक्त्या धर्मसाधारण्यलाभात् । नह्युपमानोपमेययोरनुगत्या धर्मस्य मुख्यसाधारण्य स्वोपमालंकारः ।।

पाण्ड्योऽयमंसार्पितलम्बहारः क्लृप्तांगरागो नवचन्दनेन ।
आभाति बालातपरक्तसानुः सनिर्झरोद्गार इवाद्रिराजः ।।

इत्यादौ हरिचन्दनबालातपहारनिर्झरादीनां बिम्बप्रतिबिम्बभावेन निर्दिष्टानामपि साधारणधर्मत्वांगीकारात् । ननु सकलकलमित्यादावपि गुणसाम्यं चेदुपमैव स्यादिति चेत् शब्दसाम्यमात्रं चेदपि किमित्युपमा न स्यात् । नहि शब्दान्यगुणादिसाम्यमेवोपमाप्रयोजकं न शब्दसाम्यमिति कुलधर्मः ।

यथा प्रह्लादनाच्चन्द्रः प्रतापात्तपनो यथा ।
तथैव सोऽभूदन्वर्थो राजा प्रकृतिरंजनात् ।।

---

१- प्रकरणोदाहरिष्य स- २- आतपत्रः स-३- तद्दुकूलाद्--ग
४- पततुगं-स ५- पूर्वार्द्ध- स पुस्तके नास्ति ६- न तद्व्यावृत्तिश्च -क,ग
तद्व्यावृत्तेः-ख ७- ननु-स - ८- ह्युपमानोपमेयानुगत्या -ख- ९- सनिर्झरोद्गारा-
स- १० ननु- सपुस्तके नास्ति ११-चेदमपि-स, चेत्तदपि-ग-१२- आदि-ग-पुस्तके न
नास्ति १३- प्रतापात्तनो-स

इत्यत्रानुगतार्थनामरूपशब्दसाम्येऽप्युपमादर्शनात् । किं तु श्लेषस्यालंकारान्तरविविक्तविषयाभावेन निरवकाशतया बलवत्त्वेनालंकारान्तरबाधक[१]त्वादुपमाप्रतिभानेऽपि तत्प्रतिभोत्पत्तिहेतुः श्लेष एव नोपमेति मंखका[२]दिभिरभ्युपेयते । ततश्च यथा शब्दसाम्यमाश्रित्यो[३]पमाप्रतिभाने तद्बाधकत्वं श्लेषस्य तथा श्लेषभित्तिकाभेदाध्यवसायलब्धाभेदगुणसाम्यमात्रमा[४]श्रित्योपमाप्रतिभानेऽपि तद्वक्तुं शक्यमिति तदनुरोधेन [५]न तत्र गुणसाम्यपरित्यागः । यत्तु रुद्रटेन- सकलकलमित्यादावुपमां समर्थयमानेन,

> स्फुटमर्थालंकारावेतावुपमासमुच्चयौ किं तु ।
> आश्रित्य शब्दमात्रं सामान्यमिहापि संभवतः ।।

इति शब्दसाम्यमात्रमिहोक्तम्, तदन्ततः शब्दसाम्यमात्रमाश्रित्याप्युपमा समर्थयितुं शक्येति[६] भावेन, न त्वभेदाध्यवसायेनापि गुणसाम्यं न संभवतीति भावेन[७] श्लिष्टविशेषणेष्वप्य[८]भेदाध्यवसायेनैक्यस्यालंकारान्तरेषु सर्वैरपि समाश्रयणात् । तस्माद्धर्मत इत्यनेन न श्लेषो व्यावर्तयितुं[९] शक्यते । वस्तुतस्तु सकलकलमित्यादावुपमैवेति[१०] व्यर्थं धर्मत इति विशेषणम् । अलंकारान्तरविविक्तस्तु[११] श्लेषस्य विषयस्तत्प्रकरणे दर्शयिष्यते । किं च विविक्तविषयाभावेना[१२]लंकारान्तरबाधकत्व[१३]मिति वाचोयुक्तिरप्ययुक्ता । विषयसद्भावमात्रेण निरवकाशत्वहानेर्विविक्तविषयानपेक्षणात् । नह्ययमलंकारगोचरो लोकन्यायो यद्विविक्तविषयो वक्तव्य इति । अरन्ध्ररत्नानां सुवर्णविविक्तविषयाभावेऽपि सुवर्णाश्रितानामेव चारुताहेतुत्वेनालंकारान्तरत्वव्यवस्थितेः । अन्यथा निरवकाशैररन्ध्रप्रत्युप्तरत्नैः सावकाशस्य तदाश्रयसुवर्णस्यालंकारता बाध्येत । नाप्ययं वाक्यवित्संमतः शास्त्रीयन्यायः पदे जुहोतीत्यादीनामिवोचरार्थे जुहोतीत्यादीनामाहवनीयशास्त्रादिविविक्तविषयाभावेऽपि सविषयत्वमात्रेण प्रतिष्ठितत्वात् । नाप्यसाधारण्येनैतच्छास्त्रन्यायः । सहोक्त्यादीनामतिशयोक्त्या[१४]दिविविक्तविषयाभावेऽपि तदबाधे-

---

१-साधकत्वात्-ख-२- मंखुकादि--क, ख,ग-३- मात्रम् इत्यधिकं-ख,ग-
४- मात्रं क-खपुस्तकयोः नास्ति ५- नतदनुरोधेन-ख ६- शक्यतइति भावेन-क,ख,
ग ७- भावेना श्लिष्ट-ख-८- अपि-क-ख-गपुस्तकेषु नास्ति ९- व्यावर्त्तु ख १०-
एव-इत्यधिकं-क,ख,ग ११- विभक्तस्तु-ग-१२- विषयान्तराभावेना-क,ग,विषयान्तराभावात्-ख, १३- अलंकारबाधकत्व-ख १४- मतिशयोक्त्या विविक्त--ग

नालंकारान्तरत्वव्यवहारादविरोध इहाप्यविशिष्ट: । तस्मादत्रोपमाप्रतिभोत्पत्तिहेतु: श्लेषालंकार इत्ययुक्तम् । प्रत्युतोपमैवात्र श्लेषप्रतिभोत्पत्तिहेतु: । नहि पुरवर्णनप्रकरणे सकलकलमिति तद्विशेषणपदस्य सुधांशुबिम्बमिवेत्युपमाया अनिबन्धने कलासाकल्यलक्षणार्थान्तरप्रतिभा संभवति । प्रतीपव्यावृत्त्यर्थमन्येन वर्ण्यस्य साम्यमित्युक्तं तत्रान्येनेत्ययुक्तम्[1] । अन्येनेत्यस्य[2] भिन्नविशेषणेन पौनरुक्त्यात् । किं च वर्ण्यात्प्रकृतादन्येनाप्रकृतेनेति यद्यर्थस्तदा

"इतराण्यपि रक्षांसि पेतुर्वानरकोटिषु ।
रजांसि समरोत्थानि तच्छोणितनदीष्विव[3] ।।"

इति ससुच्चितोपमायामव्याप्ति: । तत्र समरांगत्वेन रजसां शोणितेषु पतनस्यापि वर्ण्यत्वात् । यदि तु स्वयं वर्ण्येनावर्ण्येन वा कुतश्चिद्वर्ण्यादन्येनेत्यर्थ: । तदाप्युत्कृष्टगुणत्वादुपमानभावमप्यसहमानस्योपमानत्वकल्पनरूपे[4] प्रतीपेऽतिव्याप्ति: । यथा--

"अहमेव गुरु: सुदारुणानामिति हालाहल[5] तात मा स्म[6] दृप्य:[7] ।
ननु सन्ति भवादृशानि भूयो भुवनेऽस्मिन्वचनानि दुर्जनानाम् ।।"

अत्र हि वर्ण्यानां दुर्जनवचसां हालाहलेनातिप्रकृष्टदोषत्वादुपमानभावमप्यसहमानेन साम्यनिबन्धनं प्रतीपम् । अत्र वर्ण्यस्येत्यप्ययुक्तम्[8] । त्वत्कीर्ते: पुरतो भाति ज्योत्स्ना ध्वान्तमलीमसा इत्यप्रस्तुतप्रशंसासंकीर्णोपमायामव्याप्ते: । तत्र कीर्तेरेव वर्ण्यत्वेन ज्योत्स्नाया अवर्ण्यत्वात् । अपि च "अन्येन वर्ण्यस्य साम्यं वाच्यम्" इति[9] कोऽर्थ: । किमन्यप्रतियोगिकत्वेन[10] वर्ण्यगतं साम्यं वाच्यमिति, किं वा यथाकथंचिद्वर्ण्यावर्ण्योभयनिरूपितं साम्यं वाच्यम्[11] । अथवा वर्ण्यानुयोगिकत्वेन[12] साम्यं वाच्यमिति । आद्ये "सरसिजमिदमाननं च तस्या: सममिति चेतसि संमदं विधत्ते" इत्युभयविश्रान्तसादृश्योपमायामव्याप्ति: । द्वितीये प्रसिद्धप्रतीपेऽप्यतिव्याप्तिस्तदवस्था[13] । एव[14] तृतीये वर्ण्यस्य साम्यमित्येतावता विवक्षितार्थलाभादन्येनेत्यस्य

---

१- तत्रान्येनेत्युक्तमयुक्तम्-क,ख,ग २- अनेनेत्यस्य-घ-३- नदीषु च-क,ख
४- पत्युत्कृष्ट--क,ख,ग ५- हालहल घ- ६- मास्मतात-ख-७- दृप्य: ख ८- वर्णस्येत्युक्तमप्य--ग ९- इत्यस्य -ग- १०- किमन्यप्रतियोगित्वेन-क-१२- इति इत्यधिकं क-ख-ग पुस्तकेषु, १२- वर्ण्यानुपयोगिक त्वेन -घ-
१३- एव इत्यधिकं क-ख-ग पुस्तकेषु १४- एवं-ख पुस्तके नास्ति

वैयर्थ्यम् । उपमेयोपमाव्याकृत्यर्थमेकदेति विशेषणमप्ययुक्तम् । तेन 'ख-मिव जलं जलमिव खं' इत्यादौ पर्यायेण प्रवृत्तायामुपमेयोपमायामतिव्या-प्तिनिरासेऽपि

'तद्वल्गुना युगपदुन्मिषितेन ताव-
त्सद्यः परस्परतुलामधिरोहतां द्वे ।
प्रस्पन्दमानपरुषेतरतारमन्त-
श्चक्षुस्तव प्रचलितभ्रमरं च पद्मम् ।।

इति युगपत्प्रवृत्तायां तस्यामतिव्याप्त्यनिरासात् । अपि चैवम्,

'ज्योत्स्नेव नयनानन्दः सुरेव मदकारणम् ।
प्रभुतेव समाकृष्टसर्वलोका[1] नितम्बिनी ।।

इति भिन्नसाधारणधर्मायां मालोपमायामव्याप्तिः । तत्रानेकदा साम्य-प्रतिपादनात् । न च बहूपमामेलनमेव मालोपमा नैका, तासु च प्रत्येकं लक्षणमस्त्येवेति वाच्यम् । तथा सत्युपमेयोपमाप्युपमाप्रतीपमेलनमेवेति तथाकृत्यर्थं विशेषणान्तरकरणायोगात् । संसृष्टिसंकरात्पृथग्[2]ग्रन्थिकृतां लेखनमुभयत्रापि तुल्यम् । स्वमुपमेयोपमाप्रकरणे[3] उदाहरिष्यमाणायां 'रजोभिः स्यन्दनोद्धूतैः' इति परस्परोपमायामव्याप्तिः । व्यंग्योपमाव्यावृ-त्त्यर्थं वाच्यमित्युक्तमप्ययुक्तम् ।

'न पद्मं मुखमेवेदं न भृंगौ चक्षुषी इमे ।
इति विस्पष्टसादृश्यात्तत्वाख्यानोपमैव सा[4] ।।'

इत्युक्तरूपायां तत्वाख्यानोपमायां साम्यस्यावाच्यत्वेनाव्याप्त्यापत्तेः ।

'त्वदाननमधीराक्षमाविर्दशनदीधिति ।
भ्रमद्भृंगमिवालक्ष्यकेसरं भाति पंकजम् ।।'

इत्यादौ विशिष्टोपमा[5]या क्षिप्तविशेषणायुपमायामव्याप्त्यापत्तेश्च । 'शस्त्री श्यामा' इत्यादिवाचकलुप्तोपमायां 'चन्द्रमुखः सुलम्' इत्यादिसाम्यलदाकप-दवलुपमायां चाव्याप्त्यापत्तेश्च । किं च वाच्यमित्यत्र विधेयतया वाच्यतो-च्यते अनुवाद्यतया वा[5] । आद्ये

---

१- समाक्रान्त-क,ग २- संकरप्रकरणात् -क,ख,ग ३- अपि" इत्यधिकं-क-गयोः
४- विस्पष्टसादृश्या-ग ५- अपि इत्यधिकं क-ख-ग पुस्तकेषु

'स कर्णन्महतीं सेनां पूर्वसागरगामिनीम् ।

वभौ हरजटाभ्रष्टां गंगामिव भगीरथः ।।'

इत्यादावेवेदं लक्षणं स्यात् ।

'स ययौ प्रथमं प्राचीं तुल्यः प्राचीनवर्हिषा ।

अहितान[1]निलोद्धूतैस्तर्जयन्निव केतुभिः ।।'

इत्यादौ न स्यात् । द्वितीये यत्र व्यतिरेकालंकारे साम्यस्य निषेधायानु[2]याथता 'मुखेन निष्कलंकेन न समस्तव चन्द्रमाः' इत्यादौ, तत्रापीदं लक्षणं स्यात् । न च निषेधाप्रतियोगित्वेन वाच्यमिति विशेषणीयम् ।

'असिमात्रसहायोऽपि प्रभूतारिपराभवे ।

नैवान्यतुच्छजनवत्सगर्वोऽयं महाद्युतिः ।।'

इति व्यतिरेके तथाप्यतिव्याप्तेः । न च निषेधप्रतियोगिकोट्यननुप्रविष्टतया वाच्यमिति विशेषणीयम् ।

'वृथा चरसि किं भृंग तत्र तत्र वनान्तरे ।

मालत्याः सदृशीं क्वापि भ्रमन्नपि न लप्स्यसे ।।'

इत्युपमानलुप्तायामव्याप्तेः । तत्र, सदृशलाभनिषेधे साम्यस्यापि प्रतियोगिकोटिनिविष्टत्वात् । तस्माद्विधानाथो[3]क्तलक्षणमप्ययुक्तम्[4] ।

यत्तु सरस्वतीकण्ठाभरणो[5]क्तं लक्षणम्--

'प्रसिद्धेरनुरोधेन यः परस्परमर्थयोः ।

भूयोऽवयवसामान्ययोगः सेहोपमा मता ।।'

इति, तदपि गुणक्रियादीनां परस्परसादृश्यवर्णनात्मिकायाम् --

'ससज्जुरश्वक्षुण्णा[6]नामेलानामुत्पतिष्णवः ।

तुल्यगन्धिषु मत्तेभकटेषु फलरेणवः ।।'

इत्याद्युपमायामव्याप्तम् ।

'उद्भग्न[7]तरुणारिमणोपमर्द-

मग्नोन्नतस्तननिवेशनिभं हिमांशोः ।

---

१- अनुलोमानिलोद्धूतैः ख-२- निषेधात् प्रागनुवादयता-क,ग
३- अपि इत्यधिक क-ख-ग पुस्तकेषु ४- अपि -क-ख-ग पुस्तकेषु, नास्ति
५- भरणोक्तोक्तं-ख ६- ससज्जुरश्व--क (?) ख, ग ७- भुग्नोन्नत-क

बिम्बं कठोरबिसकाण्डकडारमेत-

द्विष्णोः पदं प्रथममग्रकरैर्व्यनक्ति ।।"

"सद्यो मुण्डितमत्तहूणचिबुकप्रस्पर्धि नारंगकम्" इत्यादौ प्रसिद्धिरहि-

तोपमानायां कल्पि[1]तोपमायां चाव्याप्तम् ।

यत्त्वलंकारसर्वस्वकृतोक्तम्- "उपमानोपमेययोः साधर्म्ये[2] भेदाभेदतु-

ल्यत्वे वोपमा[3] । साधर्म्ये त्रयः प्रकाराः । भेदप्राधान्यं दीपक[4]तुल्ययोगिता-

दृष्टान्तप्रतिवस्तूपमासहोक्तिव्यतिरेकादिषु । अभेदप्राधान्यं रूपकपरिणाम-

भ्रान्तिमदुल्लेखादिषु । द्वयोस्तुल्य[5]त्वं यथास्यामुपमायाम् । अत्र ह्युपमानो-

पमेयासाधारणरूपाभ्यां भेदः साधारणधर्मेणाभेदश्चेति द्वयोरपि तुल्यतैव"

इति तदप्युप[6]मानोपमेयातिव्याप्त्यादिदुष्टमिति स्पष्टमेव । तस्मादु[7]र्वचमस्या

लक्षणमिति[8] । अत्रोच्यते--

"व्यापार उपमानाख्यो भवेद्यदि विवक्षितः ।

क्रियानिष्पत्तिपर्यन्तमुपमालंकृतिस्तु सा ।।"

उपमानव्यापार उपमितिक्रियानिष्पादको व्यापारः सादृश्यवर्णना ।

सो[9]ऽयमुपमितिक्रियानिष्पत्तिपर्यन्तं विवक्षि[10]तश्चेदुपमालंकार इत्यर्थः । तथा

च व्यतिरेके नातिव्याप्तिः । तत्र सादृश्यवर्णनासत्त्वेऽपि "मुखेन निष्कलं-

केन" इत्यादौ साक्षात्तस्यैव निषेधेन, "नैवान्यत्तुच्छजनवत्" इत्यादौ तत्प्र-

योजकधर्मनिषेधेन[11] चोपमितिक्रियाया अनिष्पत्तेः । नाप्यनन्वयेऽति-

व्याप्तिः । तत्रापि स्वेन स्व[12]स्य सादृश्यस्य सदृशान्तरव्यवच्छेदे रुद्रोदन-

वपोत्खननाद्यर्थवादेऽसदर्थस्य निन्दास्तुत्योरिव द्वारमात्रतया वर्ण्यमानत्वे-

नोपमितिक्रियाया अनिष्पत्तेः । अन्यथा स्वस्य स्वेनोपमितिक्रियानिष्पत्तौ[13]

सदृशान्तरव्यवच्छेदेऽपि सर्वथानुपमत्वद्योतनं फलं न स्यात् । आहुश्च तस्य

तदेव फलं भामहादयः -

"यत्र तेनैव तस्य स्यादुपमानोपमेयता।

असादृश्यविवक्षातो वदन्ति तमनन्वयम् ।।" इति ।

अत एव वर्ण्यमानमपि स्वस्य स्वस्मिन्साधर्म्यं नान्वेतीत्यनन्वयपदव्यु-

---

१- कल्पितोपमानायां-क २- साधर्म्यभेदाभेद-ख-३- चोपमा-क,ख,ग- ४- दीपक-
ग-पुस्तके नास्ति. ५- स्तुल्यार्थत्वं-क ६- तदप्युपमेयोपमातिव्याप्त्यादि--
क,ख,ग ७- दुर्वचमस्या-ख ८- चेत् इत्यधिकं क-पुस्तके ९- सेयम-ख-१०- विवक्षिता
घ-११- न इत्यधिकं खपुस्तके १२- स्वस्य स्वेन-ख १३- निष्पत्तौ:-ख

[1]त्पत्तिमलंकारसर्वस्वकारादयो वदन्ति । ततश्च यथाम्भसि कतकरज:-संयो-जनेन रजोन्तरव्यवच्छेदे सति कतकरजसोऽपि विलयकृत्सर्वथानाविलमम्भ: सिध्यति तथा 'रामरावणयोर्युद्धं रामरावणयोरिव' इत्यादौ स्वेन सादृश्य-वर्णनया सदृशान्तरव्यवच्छेदे सति वस्तुत: स्वेनाप्युपमाया असंभवादनु-पमं रामराव[2]णयोर्युद्धमित्यत्रैव कविसंरम्भ इत्युपमितिक्रियाया अनिष्पत्ते-नानन्वयेऽतिव्याप्तिशंकावकाश: । एवं प्रतीपेऽपि यत्रोपमित्यनिष्पत्ति: ।

'आकर्णय सरोजाक्षि वचनीयमिदं भुवि ।
शशांकस्तव वक्त्रेण पामरैरुपमीयते ।।'

इत्यादौ न तत्रातिव्याप्तिशंका । उपमितिक्रियानिष्पत्तिविरहात् ।

'गर्वमसंवा[3]ह्यमिमं लोचनयुगलेन किं वहसि भद्रे ।
सन्तीदृशानि दिशि दिशि सर:सु ननु नीलनलिनानि ।।'

इत्यादि प्रतीपमुपमेयोपमा चेत्युभयमपि संग्राह्यमेवेति न तद्व्यापनं लक्षणस्य दोष: । तथा ह्युदाहृतं प्रतीपं तावदुपमाविशेष एव । सादृश्य-वर्णनस्य प्रकृतविषयत्व इवाप्रकृतविषयत्वेऽपि स्मृतिरूपकसंदेहभ्रान्त्यने-कधाग्रहणापह्नवसंभावना[4]संभववस्तुसं[5]बन्धनिबन्धननिर्दिष्टसमर्थनादीनामिवा-लंकारान्तरत्वायोगात् । अन्यथा तेषामपि प्रकृतविषयत्व एव स्मरणरूपकससंदे[6]-हभ्रान्तिमदुल्लेखापह्नुत्युत्प्रेक्षानिदर्शनार्थान्तरन्यासाद्यलंकारत्वम् [7] अप्रकृतवि-षयत्वे [8] चानलंका[9]रत्वमिति कल्पनाप्रसंगात् । स्मृत्यादयश्च प्रकृतविषया [10]इवाप्रकृतविषया अप्यलंकारभूतास्तत्र तत्रोदाहरिष्यन्ते । न चोपमायामयं नियमो यदप्रकृतेन प्रकृत[11]सादृश्यवर्णनात्मनैव तथा भाव्य[12]मिति । समुच्चयो-पमाद्युदाहरणेषु प्रकृतयोरेवाप्रकृतयोरेव वा सादृश्यवर्णनस्याप्युपमात्वांगी-कारात् । तत्प्रकृतेनाप्रकृतस्य सादृश्यवर्णनमप्युपमैवेति युक्तम् । एवं चो-पमेयोपमापि प्रकृताप्रकृतविषयोपमाद्वयरूपतया नालंकारान्तरतां भजते । अन्यथा तत्प्रकरणोदाहरिष्यमाणपरस्परोपमाया अप्यलंकारान्तरत्वप्रसंगात् । परस्परभ्रमनिबन्धनादिष्वप्यलंकारान्तरतापत्तेश्च । न चानन्वयप्रतीपोपमे-

---

१- व्युत्पत्ति-क-२- रामरावणयुद्धम्-क,ख,ग-३- संभाव्य-क,ख,ग
४- संभावनाअसंभव-ख ५- संबन्धनेननिबन्धननिर्दिष्ट-ख संबंधनिर्दिष्टं --ग,
६- संदेह -घ ७- अप्रकृताप्रकृतविषयत्वेऽपि--ख ८- अपि इत्यधिकं ख-ग-घ पुस्तकेषु ९- अलंकारान्तरत्वमिति- ख, चालंकारान्तरत्वमिति -ग
१०- इवाप्रकृतविषया गपुस्तके नास्ति ११- प्रकृत: -ख १२- भवितव्यमिति -ग

योपमासु सादृश्यवर्णनस्य पृथङ्निरूपणस्य चाविशिष्टत्वेनानन्वयस्यानुपमात्वमितरयोरुपमात्वं च वक्तुमयुक्तमिति वाच्यम्[१]। यत्रोपमितिक्रियानिष्पत्तिस्तत्रोपमाशब्दप्रवृत्तिनिमित्तसद्भावेन, यत्र तदनिष्पत्तिस्तत्र तदभावेन च वैषम्यस्य स्फुटत्वात्। इममेव विशेषमभिप्रेत्य काव्यप्रकाशिकादिलक्षणेष्वनन्वयव्युदासार्थमेव यत्नः कृतो नोपमेयोपमादिव्युदासार्थम्[२]।[३] उपमेयोपमादेरुपमान्तर्गतत्वेऽपि व्यंग्यादिकृतवैचित्र्यविशेषेण पृथग्गणनं न विरुध्यते। रूपकपरिणामवत्। "उभौ यदि व्योम्नि पृथक्प्रवाहौ" इत्यादौ[४] लक्षणाभावो न दोषः। यदि तथाभूतौ प्रवाहौ स्यातां तर्ह्युपमीयेत। न च तौ संभवतः। तस्मान्न केनाप्युपमीयत इत्युपमापरपर्यायोऽयमित्यनिष्पत्तावप्युपमात्वस्वीकारे तत्रोपमाशब्दस्य पारिभाषिकत्वापत्तेः। किंतु तत्रातिशयोक्तिविशेषोऽलंकारः। अत एव काव्यप्रकाशिकायां "प्रस्तुतस्य यदन्यत्वं यद्यर्थोक्तौ च कल्पनम्" इत्यतिशयोक्तिषु परिगणय्य यद्यर्थोक्तौ कल्पनस्य

"राकायामकलंकं चेदमृतांशोर्भवेद्वपुः।
तस्या मुखं तदा साम्यपराभवमवाप्नुयात्।

इत्युदाहृतम्।

"पुष्पं प्रवालोपहितं यदि स्यान्मुक्ताफलं वा स्फुटविद्रुमस्थम्।
ततोऽनुकुर्याद्विशदस्य तस्य[५] ताम्रौष्ठ[६]पर्यस्तरुचः[७] स्मितस्य।।"

इति तु कविकल्पितोपमानाया[८] उत्पाद्योपमेति व्यवहृताया उदाहरणम्। तत्र यद्युत्पाद्यस्योपमानस्य संभावितया तेनोपमितिनिष्पत्तेर्लक्षणमस्त्येवेति नाव्याप्तिः। न चैवं "चन्द्रबिम्बादिव विषं" इत्यसंभावितोपमायामव्याप्तिः। तत्रासंभावितेनैवोपमानेनोपमितिक्रियानिष्पत्तेः। कविना विवक्षितत्वेन विवक्षानुसार्युपमितिक्रियानिष्पत्तिसद्भावात्[९]। नहि "वस्तुसदर्थ[१०]निबन्धनोपमितिक्रियानिष्पत्तिरुपमा"[११] इति लक्षणमुच्यते किं तु कविविवक्षानिबन्धना। अत एव श्लोके विवक्षित इति विशेषणमर्थवत्। अन्यथा

---

१- शक्यम्-ख २-- व्युदासार्थः -ग ३- उपमेयोपमादेः ख- पुस्तकेनास्ति
४- इत्यत्र-ख ५- तस्याः-क ६- ताम्रोष्ठ--क,ख ७- रुचे-ख ८- कविकल्पितोपमाया-ख ९- संभवात्- क,ख,ग १०- सदर्थानिबन्धना-घ, ११--
निष्पत्तिरुपमितिलक्षणम्-क

'चन्द्र इव मुखम्' इत्यादावपि लक्षणं न स्यात्। चन्द्रगतकान्त्यतिशयस्य वस्तुतो मुखेऽभावेन विवक्षानुसरणं विना गत्यभावात्। 'चन्द्रधवला कीर्तिः' इत्यादौ च सर्वथैव लक्षणं न स्यात्। कीर्तौ धावल्यस्य[1] लेशतोऽप्यभावात्। न चैवमनन्वयेऽपि कविविवक्षया स्वस्य स्वेनोपमितिक्रियानिष्पत्तिः संभवतीति वाच्यम्। सर्वथैवानुपपत्त्यर्थोऽतेन कविसंरम्भे सति तथा विवक्षानुदयात्[2]। 'वृथा चरसि किं भृंग' इत्यादौ सादृश्याधिकरणस्यानुपलम्भोक्त्यो[3]-पलभ्यमानेषु सादृश्यनिषेधपर्यवसानेऽप्यनुपलभ्यमानगतसादृश्याभ्यनुज्ञानात्त्रोपमितिक्रियानिष्पत्तिरस्तीति नाव्याप्तिः। अत एव तस्य विशिष्यानुपादानादुपमानलुप्तता। एवम्

'निरूप्यमाणं कविना सादृश्यं स्वात्मनो न चेत्।
प्रतिषेधमुपादाय पर्यवस्यति सोपमा।।'

इत्यपि लक्षणमनुसंधेयम्।

उपमितिक्रियानिष्पत्तिमत्सादृश्यवर्णनमुपमा।
स्वनिषेधापर्यवसायि[4] सादृश्यवर्णनमुपमा।

इति द्विविधमप्येतदुपमासामान्यलक्षणम्। अलंकारभूतोपमालक्षणं त्वेतदेवादुष्टाव्यंग्यत्वविशेषितम्। विशिष्टोपमादिस्थले विशेषणाद्युपमानां वाच्यभूतविशिष्टोपमादिसिद्ध्यंगत्वात्[5]। वाच्यसिद्ध्यंगरूपगुणीभूतव्यंग्यतयैव[6] तासां नालंकारतेति न तदव्यापनं दोषः। 'न पद्मं मुखमेवेदं' इत्यादौ नोपमालंकारः। किंतु प्रतिषेधादिप्तप्रसक्तितया[7] भ्रान्तिमान्, तदुपपादकतयोपमा चेत्युभयं व्यंग्यम्। तथापि भ्रान्तिमदादिकमपि साधर्म्यमूलत्वमात्रेणोपमामध्ये परिगणयता[8] दण्डिना तत्वाख्यानोपमेत्येतादृशव्यवहारः कृतः, परमिति न तत्राप्यव्याप्तिर्दोष[9] इति दिक्।

सा चेयमुपमा द्विविधा पूर्णा लुप्ता च।
उपमानोपमेयसाधारणधर्मोपमावाचकानां चतुर्णामुपादाने पूर्णा।
तेषामेकस्य द्वयोस्त्रयाणां वा लोपे सति लुप्ता[10]।

---

१- धवलस्य (?) -क २- विवक्षानुपादानात्-क-३- स्यानुपलम्भो-क-
४- स्वनिषेधपर्यवसायि-ख ५- वाच्यभूतविशिष्टोपमादिसिद्ध्यर्थत्वात्-ख, [illegible]भूतसिद्ध्यंगत्वात्-ग ६- व्यंग्यतेव-ख ७- प्रतिषेधोन्नीतप्रसक्ति ख ७- अपि - ग पुस्तके नास्ति ९- एणा इत्यधिकं क-ख-ग-पुस्तकेषु
१०- च इत्यधिक गपुस्तके

पूर्णायां क्वचित्साधारणधर्मस्यानुगामितया निर्देशः। क्वचिद्वस्तुप्रतिवस्तुभावेन। क्वचिद्बिम्बप्रतिबिम्बभावेन। क्वचिच्छ्लेषेण। क्वचिदुपचारेण। क्वचित्समासान्तराश्रयेण। क्वचिदेषां यथासंभवं मिश्रणेन। लुप्तायां तु नैवं भेदाः। तस्यां साधारणधर्मस्यानुगामित्वनियमात्। किं तु प्रकारान्तरेण भेदा वक्ष्यन्ते। तत्र पूर्णायां धर्मस्यानुगामिता यथा--

'वागर्थाविव संपृक्तौ वागर्थप्रतिपत्तये[1]।
जगतः पितरौ वन्दे पार्वतीपरमेश्वरौ ॥'

औत्पत्तिकस्तु शब्दस्यार्थेन संबन्ध इति वागर्थयोर्नित्यसंबन्धित्वं प्रसिद्धम्। उमामहेश्वरयोरप्यनयोर्न पृथग्भावः चन्द्रचन्द्रिकयोरिवेति तत्प्रसिद्धम्। तथा च नित्यसंबन्धित्वरूपोऽत्र साधारणधर्मोऽनुगामितया निर्दिष्टः। यद्यप्युमामहेश्वरयोर्वागर्थवन्नित्यसंबन्धित्ववर्णनेन तयोर्निरतिशयपरस्परप्रेमशालित्वं महामहिमत्वमित्यादि[2] व्यज्यते तथापि न ध्वनि[3]गुणीभूतव्यंग्यव्यवहारः। न खलु व्यंग्यसंस्पर्शप्रतिभासादेवात्र चारुताप्रतीतिः, किं तु वाच्यवैचित्र्यप्रतिभासादपीति प्रायस्तत्र संभव[4]द्रसादि[5]रूपं व्यंग्यमलंकारान्तरं चागणयित्वैव तत्तदलंकारा उदाह्रियन्ते।

एकस्यैव धर्मस्य संबन्धिभेदेन द्विरुपादानं वस्तुप्रतिवस्तुभावः। स तु शुद्धो न संभवति। किं तु विशेषणतया विशेष्यतया वा सर्वत्र बिम्बप्रतिबिम्बभावकरम्बितः। वस्तुतोऽभिन्नयोर्धर्मयोः परस्परसादृश्यादभिन्नतयाध्यवसितयोर्द्विरुपादानं बिम्बप्रतिबिम्बभावः। तत्र वस्तुप्रतिवस्तुभावस्य विशेषणता यथा--

'यान्त्या मुहुर्वलितकंधरमाननं त-
दावृत्तवृन्तशतपत्रनिभं वहन्त्या।
दिग्धोऽमृतेन च विषेण च पक्ष्मलाक्ष्या
गाढं निखात इव मे हृदये कटाक्षः ॥'

अत्र बिम्बप्रतिबिम्बभावेन निर्दिष्टयोः कंधरावृन्तयोर्वलितावृत्त-

---

१- वागर्थ इत्यारभ्य चरणत्रितयं खपुस्तके नास्ति २- 'च' इत्यधिक कपुस्तके ३- ध्वनि - गपुस्तके नास्ति ४- संभवाद्रसादि--- क ५- रूपव्यंग्यमलंकारान्तरं ग

ब्दाभ्यामेक एव धर्मो विशेषणतया निर्दिष्ट: । विशेष्यता यथा--

'सा तेन जगृहे साध्वी हठात्साध्वसकम्पिता ।

वानरेणातिलोलेन वाताधूतेव[1] बल्लरी ।।'

अत्र साध्वसवातयोर्विम्बप्रतिबिम्बभावापन्नयो: कम्पित[2]धूतशब्दाभ्यामेक एव धर्मो विशेष्यतया निर्दिष्ट: । शुद्धबिम्बप्रतिबिम्बभावो यथा-- 'पाण्ड्योऽयमंसार्पितलम्बहार:' इत्यादि । अत्र हरिचन्दनबालातपौ हारनिर्झरौ च बिम्ब[3]प्रतिबिम्बभावेन निर्दिष्टौ । श्लेषो यथा--

'नरसिंह महीपाल समस्तोऽपि रिपुस्तव ।

पारावारसमानत्वं दधाति स्वपदच्युत: ।।'

उपचारो यथा--

'उद्भवन्तमुदितार्चिषं[4] ततो भानुमन्तमिव हेमभूभृत: ।

पंकजैरिव कुमारमीक्षणैर्विस्मयेन विकचै: पपुर्जना: ।।'

अत्र विकास: पुष्पधर्म उपमेयेषु वीक्षणे[5]षूपचरित: । समासभेदाश्रयणं यथा--

'तया विवृद्धाननचन्द्रकान्त्या प्रफुल्लचक्षु:कुमुद: कुमार्या ।

प्रसन्नचेत: सलिल: शिवोऽभूत्संसृज्यमान: शरदेव लोक: ।।

अत्र विवृद्धाननचन्द्रकान्त्येति विशेषणं देव्यां शरदि च समासभेदेन प्रवर्तते । मिश्रणेष्वनुगामित्वबिम्बप्रतिबिम्बभाव[6]योर्मिश्रणं यथा--

'भीमकान्तैर्नृपगुणै: स बभूवोपजीविनाम् ।

अधृष्यश्चाभिगम्यश्च यादोरत्नैरिवार्णव: ।।'

अत्राधृष्यत्वमभिगम्यत्वं[7] च नृपगुणानां यादोरत्नानां च बिम्बप्रतिबिम्बभावमपेक्ष्य लब्धात्मकं साधारणो[8] धर्म: । अनुगामित्वश्लेषयोर्मिश्रणं यथा--

'गते तव भ्रातरि वत्स[9] पंचतां चिराय नश्चान्द्रमसं कुलं महत् ।

अदृष्टसंतानतया न शोभते वनं हरे: प्राङ्मथनादिवोदधे: ।।'

अत्र संतानशब्दश्लेषमपेक्ष्य लब्धात्मकं शोभारहितत्वं साधारणो धर्म: । अनुगामित्वोपचारयोर्मिश्रणं यथा--

---

१- वाताधूतेव-क २- कम्पिताधूतशब्दाभ्याम्-क,ख,ग,घ ३- बिम्बभावेन-ख
४- उदितार्चिषस्ततो-ख ५- ईक्षणेषु-क,ग- ६- भावयोरनुमिश्रणं-क,ख
७- अधृष्यमभिगम्यत्वं-क-८- साधारणधर्म:-ख-९- वत्स-क

'तडिदुज्ज्वलहेतिभासुरः कुरराजध्वजिनीं विलोकयन् ।
प्रिययेव भिया सकम्पया परिरेभे धृतधर्मपायसा ।।'

अत्र सकम्पत्वानुगामिधर्मापेक्षया लब्धचाक्षुभावं परिरम्भकर्तृत्वं भीत्यामुपचरितम् । अनुगामित्वसमासभेदाश्रयणयोर्मिश्रणं[1] यथा--

'श्येनपक्षपरिधूसरालकाः सांध्यमेघरुधिरार्द्रवाससः ।
अंगना इव रजस्वला दिशो नो बभूवुरवलोकनक्षमाः ।।'

अत्र श्येनपक्षपरि[2]धूसरेत्यादिविशेषणयोः समासभेदाश्रयणेन साधारण्यमपेक्ष्यानवलोकनक्षमत्वमनुगामिधर्मश्चारुतातिशयं पुष्णाति । वस्तुप्रतिवस्तुभावबिम्बप्रतिबिम्बभावयोर्मिश्रणं यथा--

'लिंगैर्मुदः सं[3]वृतविक्रियास्ते ह्रदाः प्रसन्ना इव गूढनक्राः ।
वैदर्भमामन्त्र्य ययुस्तदीयां प्रत्यर्प्य पूजामुपदाच्छलेन[4] ।।'

अत्र बिम्बप्रतिबिम्बभावापन्नयोः क्रोधनक्रयोः संवृतगूढशब्दाभ्यामेक एव धर्म उक्त इति बिम्बप्रतिबि[5]म्बभाववस्तुप्रतिवस्तुभावः । संतोषचिन्हप्रसादयोर्बिम्बप्रतिबिम्बभावश्च । श्लेषबिम्बप्रतिबिम्बभावयोर्मिश्रणं यथा--

'पार्थनाशमुदिता नृपात्मजा बाष्प[6]मुरभिनीतमन्यवः ।
आतपक्वथितपाथसो बहिः शीतगर्भसलिला इव ह्रदाः ।'

अत्र बा[7]ष्पशब्दे श्लेषस्य नृपात्मजह्रदविशेषणानां बिम्बप्रतिबिम्बभावमपेक्ष्य चारुता । उपचारबिम्बप्रतिबिम्बभावयोर्मिश्रणं यथा--

'सा किलाश्वासिता चण्डी भर्त्रा तत्संश्रुतौ वरौ ।
उद्वामेन्द्रसिक्ता भूर्बिलमग्नाविवोरगौ ।।'

अत्राश्वासितेन्द्रसिक्तेत्यनयोर्वरोरगाणां च बिम्बप्रतिबिम्बभावमपेक्ष्योद्वमनमुपमानोपमेययोर्द्वयोरप्युपचरितम् । मुख्यार्थस्य द्वयोरप्यसंभवात् । मुख्यार्थे तस्य ग्राम्यत्वाच्च । तदाहुः[8]-

'निष्ठ्यूत[9]गीर्णवान्तादि गौणवृत्तिव्यपाश्रयम् ।
अतिसुन्दरमन्यत्तु ग्राम्यकक्षां विगाहते ।।' इति ।।

---

१- भेदाश्रयणं यथा-क-२- परि-ग- पुस्तके नास्ति ३- संवृत-क,ख,ग-
४- मुपदाच्छलेन -ख-५- बिम्बप्रतिबिम्बभाव-कपुस्तकेनास्ति, बिम्बप्रतिबिम्बवस्तुप्रतिवस्तुभावः -ख- ६- अभिनीत-ख, अविनीत-घ- ७- बाष्पशब्दश्लेषस्य-क,ग ८- यदाहुः- क,ख,ग

एवमन्यदपि द्वयोर्मिश्रणमूह्यम् । अनुगामित्वबिम्बप्रतिबिम्बभावसमासभेदाश्रयणानां मिश्रणं यथा--

> 'नृपं तमावर्तमनोज्ञनाभिः[१] सा व्यत्यगादन्यवधूर्भवित्री ।
> महीधरं मार्गवशादुपेतं स्रोतोवहा सागरगामिनीव ।।'

अत्र व्यत्यगादित्यनुगामिधर्मः । अन्यवधूर्भवित्री सागरगामिनीत्यनयोर्बिम्बप्रतिबिम्बभावः । आवर्तमनोज्ञनाभिरित्यत्र[२] समासभेदाश्रयणमित्येतेषां मिश्रणम् । अनुगामित्वश्लेषोपचाराणां मिश्रणं यथा--

> 'असौ मरुच्चुम्बितचारुकेसरः प्रसन्नताराधिपमण्डलाग्रणीः ।
> वियुक्तरामातुरदृष्टिवीक्षितो वसन्तकालो हनुमानिवागतः ।।'

अत्रातुरदृष्टिवीक्षित इत्यादावनुगामिता । रामादिशब्दे[३] श्लेषः । चुम्बितशब्दस्य वसन्तपदे उपचारः । इत्येतेषां मिश्रणम् । एवमन्येऽपि मिश्रणोदाहरणभेदाः स्वयमेव द्रष्टव्याः । बिम्बप्रतिबिम्बभावोदाहरणेषु कश्चिद्विशेषः । क्वचित्प्रसिद्धसाधर्म्यतया प्रतीयमानसाधर्म्ययो[४]र्बिम्बप्रतिबिम्बभावः । यथा- 'पाण्ड्योऽयमंसार्पितलम्बहारः' इत्यादौ । क्वचिदप्रसिद्धसाधर्म्यतया येनकेनचित्प्रकारेणोपात्तसाधारणधर्मयोर्बिम्बप्रतिबिम्बभावः । यथा-- 'तया विवृद्धाननचन्द्रकान्त्या' इत्यादौ । अत्र हि शरदपर्णयोः स्वतोऽप्रसिद्धसाधर्म्ययोर्विवृद्धाननेत्यादिना समासभेदाश्रयणेनोपात्तसाधारणधर्मयोरेव बिम्बप्रतिबिम्बभावः । यथाकथंचित्साधर्म्यप्रतीतिं विना बिम्बप्रति[५]बिम्बभावो न संभवत्येव ।

> 'यथा त्वं गुणवाँल्लोके तथा ते निर्गुणो रिपुः[६] ।
> इतीदमुपमानं तु विपरीतमिति स्मृतम् ।।'

इत्युक्तरूपाया[७]: विपरीतोपमायाः कथं निर्वाहः । तत्र हि सगुणत्वनिर्गुणत्वयोर्नोपात्तेन न[८] वा प्रतीयमानेन[९] धर्मेण साधर्म्यप्रतीतिरस्ति । नैष दोषः । तत्राप्यात्यन्तिकत्व[१०]स्वाभाविकत्वादिधर्मेण प्रतीयमानेन तयोः साधर्म्यप्रतीतेः । अन्यथा यथाशब्दोदितस्य सादृश्यस्य सर्वथा निरालम्बनत्वप्रसङ्गात् । एवं[११] पूर्णाया दिगुदाहृता ।

---

१- गभीरनाभिः -क,ख,ग २- गभीरनाभि-क,ग, सरोजनाभि-ख- ३- रामादिशब्दश्लेषः ख,घ ४- सादृश्ययोः -- क, ग ५- बिम्बभावो- ख ६- रिहः (?) ख-७- इत्युक्तरूपाय -घ ८- न इति गपुस्तके नास्ति ९- प्रतीयमानेन वा -ग १०- तत्राप्यन्त्यन्ति -- ख ११- एषा-ख

लुप्ता[१]ऽष्टविधा-वाचकलुप्ता, धर्मलुप्ता, उपमानलुप्ता, वाचकोपमानलुप्ता, धर्मोपमानलुप्ता, धर्मवाचकलुप्ता, वाचकोपमेयलुप्ता, धर्मोपमानवाचकलुप्ता चेति[२]। क्रमेणोदाहरणानि--

'कैलास[३]गौरं वृषमारुरुक्षोः पादार्पणानुग्रहपूतपृष्ठम्।
अवेहि मां किंकरमष्टमूर्तेः कुम्भोदरं नाम निकुम्भतुल्यम्।।'

अत्र कैलासगौरमित्यत्र वाचकलोपः। निकुम्भतुल्यमित्यत्र धर्मलोपः। वाचकलोपः सर्वत्र समासा[४]दिविधायकशास्त्रकृ[५]तः। धर्मलोपस्त्वैच्छिकः। प्रभावादिना निकुम्भतुल्यमित्यपि वक्तुं शक्यत्वात्।

'यच्चोराणामस्य च समागमो यच्च तैर्वधोऽस्य कृतः।
उपनतमेतदकस्मादासीत्तत काकतालीयम्।।'

इत्यत्र काकतालशब्दौ वृत्तिविषये काकतालसमवेतक्रियावर्तिनौ। तेन काका[६]गमनमिव तालपत[७]नमिव काकताल[८]मिति इवार्थे समासाच्च तद्विषयात्[९]' इति ज्ञापकात्सुप्सुपेति समासः।उभयत्रोपमेयं क्रमेण देवदत्तागमनं दस्यूपनिपातश्च। तेन देवदत्तदस्यु[१०]समागमः काकतालसमागमसदृश इति फलति। ततः काकतालमिव काकतालीयमिति द्वितीये इवार्थे समासाच्च तद्विषयात्' इति छप्रत्ययः। ततश्च पतता तालफलेन यथा काकस्य वध[११] एवमुपनिपतितैर्दस्युभिर्देवदत्तस्य वध इत्यर्थः। यदाह भगवान्भाष्यकारः-'एवं तर्हि द्वाविवा[१२]र्थौ काकागमनमिव तालपतनमिव काकतालं काकतालमिव काकतालीयम्' इति। तच्च विवृतं कैयटेन--

'तत्र काकागमनं देवदत्तागमनस्योपमानम्। तालपतनं दस्यूपनिपातस्य। तालेन तु यः काकस्य वधः स देवदत्तस्य दस्युना वधस्योपमानमिति। अकस्मादुपनतत्वं च समानो धर्मः। तदाह वृत्तिकारः --तेन काकतालीयं नामाकस्मादुपनतं चित्रीकरणमुच्यते इति। ततश्चात्र काकागमनतालपतनसमागमन[१३]रूपस्य पत्त्तालकृतकाकवधरूपस्य चोपमानस्यानुपादानात् छ प्रत्ययार्थोपमायामुपमानलोपः[१४]।समासार्थोपमायां वाचकोमानलोपः।अत्रैव 'किमिति ब्रूमो वयमिदम्' इति तृतीयपादपाठे प्रत्ययार्थोपमायां धर्मोपमानलोपः। समासार्थो[१५]पमायां धर्मोपमानवाचकलोपः। अत्र

---

१- अष्टधा-ग २-चेति इति खपुस्तके नास्ति ३- कैलासतुल्यम् इति प्रथमपदमात्रं खपुस्तके अस्ति ४- समासविधायक-घ- ५- कृत इति खपुस्तके नास्ति ६- काकागमनमिव-ख ७- पनमिव ख-८- काकतालीयमिति -ख ९- तद्विषयादिज्ञापकात्- ख, १०- देवदत्तस्य समागम-ख ११- काकवधः -क,ख,ग १२- द्वाविवार्थौ-क ख,घ१३- -समागरूपस्य -क, समागमरूपस्य- ख-- १४- प्रत्ययार्थोपमाया धर्मोपमानलोपः ख-१५- समासार्थोपमायाम् इत्यारभ्य समासपदत्वात् (२५ पृ०)इत्यन्तं खपुस्तके नास्ति

धर्मलोपमात्रमैच्छिकम् ।

'यं त्वं पालयसे धर्मं वृत्त्या[१] च नियमेन च ।

स वै राघवशार्दूल धर्मस्त्वामभिरक्षतु ।।'

अत्र राघवः शार्दूल इवेत्यर्थे 'उपमितं व्याघ्रादिभिः सामान्याप्रयोगे' इति समासे धर्मवाचकयोर्लोपः । अत्र वाचकलोपवद्धर्मलोपोऽपि शास्त्रीयः । सामान्याप्रयोग[२] एवैतत्समासानुशासनात् । धर्मवाचकलुप्तायां धर्मलोपस्यैच्छिकत्वमपि संभवति । यथा--

'नृणां यं सेवमानानां संसारोऽप्यपवर्गति ।

तं जगत्यजन्मत्यर्यश्चञ्चा चन्द्रकलाधरम् ।।'

अत्रापवर्ग इवाचरतीत्यर्थेऽपवर्गतीत्यत्राचारार्थस्य क्विपो लोपाद्वाचकवद्धर्मस्यापि लोपः । चञ्चेत्यत्र चञ्चा तृणपुरुष इवेत्यस्मिन्नर्थे 'इवे प्रतिकृतौ' इति विहितस्य कनो[३] 'लुम्मनुष्ये' इति लुब्विधानाद्वाचकलोपो धर्मलोपश्च । अस्य श्लोकस्य

'यद्भक्तानां सुखमयः संसारोऽप्यपवर्गति ।

तं शंभुमजन्मत्यर्यश्च जीवात्महिताकृते: ।।'

इति पाठेनोभयत्रापि[४] धर्मस्य श्रवणमपि संभवति ।

'रूपयौवनलावण्यस्पृहणीयतराकृतिः ।

पुरतो हरिणाक्षीणामेण पुष्पायुधीयति ।।'

अत्र वाचकोपमेययोर्लोपः । रूपयौवनेत्यादिविशेषणसामर्थ्यात्स्वात्मानं पुष्पायुधमिवाचरतीत्यस्यार्थस्य गम्यमानत्वात् स्वात्मन उपमेयस्य लोपः कवेरैच्छिकः । न चैण इत्युपमेयस्योपादानमस्तीति शंक्यम्[५] । तस्य कर्मविभक्त्यभावेन पुष्पायुधीयतीत्यत्रोपमेयासमर्पकत्वात् । अत्रैव हरिणस्याक्षिणी इवायते अक्षिणी आसामित्यस्मिन्नर्थेऽनुशिष्टे हरिणाक्षीणामिति पदे धर्मोपमानवाचकानां लोपः । सर्वोऽप्ययं 'सप्तम्युपमानपूर्वपदस्य' इत्यादिशास्त्रकृत एव लोपः । त्रिलोपे धर्मलोपस्त्वैच्छिकोऽपि संभवति । यथा ---

---

१- घृत्या - ग २- सामान्यप्रयोग-घ- ३- क्वणो-ख ४- पाठे नोभयत्रापि-ख, घ ५- शंकनीयम्-ग

'यच्चौराणामस्य च' इति श्लोकस्य द्वितीयपाठे समासार्थोपमायाम् । एवं लुप्ताया[१] अष्टौ विधाः प्रदर्शिताः ।

काव्यप्रकाशिकाकारादिभिस्तु पूर्णायाः षड्विधाः लुप्तायास्तु धर्मलुप्तादिष्ववान्तरभेदेन केश्चिदेकोनविंशतिरन्यैर्विंशतिविधाः[२] प्रदर्शिताः । तत्रायं विभागः --पूर्णा तावद्द्विविधा[३] श्रौती आर्थी च । सादृश्यमात्रवाचकयथेवादिशब्दवती श्रौती । सादृश्यविशिष्टधर्मिपर्यन्ततत्तुल्यसदृशसंकाशादिशब्दवती[४] आर्थी । द्विविधापि वाक्ये समासे तद्धिते चेत्येवं षड्विधा पूर्णा । धर्मलुप्तापि पूर्णावदेव विभागवती । किं तु श्रौती तद्धिते न संभवतीत्येवं[५] पञ्चविधा । वाचकलुप्ता कर्मकर्तृणमुलोः कर्माधिकरणक्यचोः क्यङि णिनौ समासे चेत्येवं सप्तविधा । उपमानलुप्ता वाक्यसमासयोर्द्विविधा[६] । धर्मवाचकलुप्ता क्विप्समासयोर्द्विविधा[७] । धर्मोपमानलुप्ता वाक्यसमासयोर्द्विविधा उपमेयवाचकलुप्ता क्यचि एकविधा । धर्मवाचकोपमानलुप्ता समास एवैकविधेति । यदाहुः-

'पूर्णा लुप्ता च सा द्वेधा श्रौत्यार्थी चेति ते पुनः ।
द्विविधे प्रथमा वाक्ये समासे तद्धिते भवेत् ।।
तद्वल्लुप्तापि धर्मस्य लोपे श्रौती न तद्धिते ।
इवादिलोपे द्विविधे णमुलि क्यचि च क्यङि ।।
तथा णिनौ समासे च सप्तधा परिकीर्तिता ।
उपमानस्य लोपे तु द्विधा वाक्यसमासयोः ।
इवादिधर्मलोपेऽपि द्विविधा क्विप्समासयोः ।
धर्मोपमानयोर्लोपे वाक्यगा च समासगा ।।
इवादेरुपमेयस्य द्वयोर्लोपे भवेत्क्यचि ।
इवादिधर्मोपमानलोपे त्वेषा समासगा ।।' इति ।।

अत्रोदाहरणानि तन्मतरीत्या संगृह्यास्माभिर्लिख्यन्ते--

'यस्याज्ञा शिरसोह्यते सुमनसां वृन्दैर्यथा मालिका
बद्धा मुञ्चति यः पशूनिव जनान्यस्याप्रवद्भैभवम् ।

---

१- लुप्तोपमायाम्-क,ग-२- विंशतिर्विधाः-क- ३- द्विधा- क- ४- धर्मिपर्याप्त - ख, घ ५- तद्धितेन संभवति- घ-६- द्विधा-क ७- द्विधा-क

इयं शैवधिना समं हृदि भजन्त्यानन्दसारोपमं

यं धन्याः शशिवत्प्रसन्नवपुषे तस्मै नमः शंभवे ।।

अत्र षड्विधापि पूर्णा दर्शिता । तत्र प्रथमवाक्ये वाक्यगा श्रौती । द्वितीयवाक्ये समासगा श्रौती । 'इवेन नित्यसमासो विभक्त्यलोपः पूर्वपदप्रकृतिस्वरत्वं च' इति वार्तिककृद्वचनेन पशुनिवेत्यस्य समासपदत्वात् । तृतीयवाक्ये तद्धितगा श्रौती । अभ्रवदिति षष्ठीसमर्थाद्वतेः 'तत्र तस्येव'[1] इति सूत्रेणेवार्थे विहितत्वात् । 'इयं शैवधिना समं हृदि भजन्ति' इत्यत्र वाक्यगा आर्थी । 'आनन्दसारोपमं' इत्यत्र समासगा आर्थी । इयमिति विशेषणद्वयमत्राप्यपेद्यते । अन्यथा धर्मलुप्तैव स्यान्न पूर्णा । शशिवदित्यत्र तद्धितगा आर्थी । तत्रत्यवतेः 'तेन तुल्यं क्रिया चेद्वतिः' इति तुल्यार्थे[2] विहितत्वात् ।

'मूर्तिर्यथा नवसुधा बलमिन्मणीव[3]

कण्ठप्रभा सुसदृशश्च जटास्तडिद्भिः ।

शलादि काञ्चननिभं पदमब्जदेश्यं

यस्येष मेऽस्तु हृदि दैवतसार्वभौमः ।।

अत्र पञ्चविधापि धर्मलुप्ता दर्शिता । तत्र मूर्तिर्यथा नवसुधेति वाक्यगा[4] । बलमिन्मणीव[5] कण्ठप्रभेति समासगा श्रौती[6] । उभयत्रापि भातीत्यादिक्रियाप्रयोगे सैव साधारणो धर्म इति धर्मलुप्ता न भवेत्, अतस्तदप्रयोगः । श्रौती तु धर्मलुप्ता तद्धिते न संभवति । षष्ठीसमर्थात्सप्तमीसमर्थाद्वा इवार्थे विहितस्य वतेर्धर्मोपादानं विनान्वयसौकर्याभावात् । न च[7] वाच्यं 'इवे[8] प्रतिकृतौ' इत्यधिकारे इवार्थे विहितस्य तद्धितस्य धर्मोपादानं विना नैराकांक्ष्यमस्ति । 'कुशाग्रीया बुद्धिः' शैलेयं[9] दधि[10] 'पौण्डरीकं मुखम्' इति दर्शनात् । अतस्तत्र श्रौती धर्मलुप्ता तद्धित उदाहर्तुं शक्यत इति 'इवे प्रतिकृतौ' इत्यधिकारे विहितप्रत्ययानां तुल्यार्थ एव विधानात् । अन्यथा तेषां सादृश्यविशिष्टधर्मिपर्यन्तत्वाभावेन कुशाग्रीया बुद्धिरित्याद्युपमेयसामानाधिकरण्याभावात्सादृश्यविधानमपि सदृशे पर्यवस्यति सामानाधि-

---

१- तस्यैवेति-ख २- तुल्यार्थे इति ग पुस्तके नास्ति ३- बलीमणीव -ख ४- श्रौती इत्यधिकं कपुस्तके ५- वर्णीव-ख ६- च इत्यधिक क-ख-ग पुस्तकेषु ७- नचनच- स ८- इवेच प्रतिकृता-ख ९- शिलेयं -स १०- दधिः - स

करण्यदर्शनादिति सूत्रे इवग्रहणं न विरुध्यते । सुसदृशश्चेत्यादि वा-[१]क्यत्रये क्रमेणार्थी वाक्यगा समासगा तद्धितगा च । अदेश्यमित्यत्रेण[२]दसमाप्तौ विहितोऽपि देश्यप्रत्ययः सादृश्ये प्रयुज्यते। सोऽपि सामानाधि-करण्यात्सदृश[३]पर्यवसायी । ननु सदृशादिशब्दप्रयोगे सादृश्यविशिष्टध-र्मिपर्यन्तत्वादार्थी[४]ति युक्तम्[५] । सादृश्यादिशब्दप्रयोगे कथम् । किं श्रौती उतार्थी । यथा--

'परस्परातिसादृश्यमद्रोज्झित[६]वर्त्मसु ।
मगद्वन्द्वेषु पश्यन्तौ स्यन्दनाबद्धदृष्टिषु ।।'

इत्यादौ श्रौत्येवेति[७] ब्रूमः । तत्र तद्धितप्रकृत्या धर्मिपर्यन्ताभिधानेऽपि प्रधानप्रत्ययाभिहितस्य सादृश्यस्यैव वाक्यार्थान्वयित्वात् ।

'यं पश्यन्दीपदर्शं[८] सपदि[९] मनसिजः कीटनाशं स नष्टः
सान्ते योऽन्तःपुरीयत्य[१०]तिभजनकृतस्तं कुमारीयति द्राक् ।
मूल[११]स्तम्भायते यस्त्रिभुवनभवने कोकिलालापिनी यं
वामांगे कल्पवल्ली श्रयति कुवलयश्यामला तं भजामि ।।'

अत्र सप्तविधापि वाचकलुप्ता दर्शिता । तत्र दीपमिव पश्यन्नित्यर्थे दीपदर्शमिति[१२] कर्मणमुलि, कीट इव नष्ट इत्यर्थे[१३] कीटनाशं नष्ट इति कर्तृणमुलि[१४], सान्तेऽन्तःपुर इवाचरतीत्यर्थेऽन्तःपुरीयतीत्यधिकरणक्यचि, कुमारं स्कन्दमिवाचरतीति कर्मक्यचि, त्रिभुवनस्योत्पत्तौ मूलस्तम्भ इवा-चरतीत्यर्थे[१५] मूलस्तम्भायत इति कर्तृक्यङि, कोकिल इवालपतीत्यर्थे कोकि-लालापिनीति णिनौ, कुवलयमिव श्यामलेत्यर्थे कुवलयशमलेति समासे च क्रमेण वाचकलुप्ता द्रष्टव्या ।

'पूजनं सुरिपोस्तनोतु मे चित्तमन्यदपहाय चापलम् ।
यत्समं प्रियहितं न दृश्यते येन ना[१६]पि सदृशं निशम्यते ।।'

अत्र यत्सममिति समासे येन सदृशमिति वाक्ये चोपमानलुप्ता द्वि-विधापि दर्शिता ।

'वृथा मम भ्रमत्यहो[१७] मनः स्थिते महेश्वरे
श्रुतोऽस्ति तेन किं समः स्मृतोऽथवास्ति तत्समः ।

---

१- वाक्यत्रय-ख २- परिसमाप्तौ-ग-३- सादृश्यपर्यवस ख ४- इति इति क-ग-पुस्तकयोः नास्ति, आर्थीत्युक्त-ख- ५- युक्ता-ग ६- मद्राम्फित-ख-७- त्या( आर्थ्येव तत्र तद्धितप्रकृत्यर्थिपर्यन्ताभिधानपूर्वकमेव भावप्रत्ययेन सादृश्याभिधानात् । वस्तुतः इत्यधिक क-गपुस्तकयोः ८- दीपदर्शन -ख- ९- सपदि-खपुस्तके नास्ति १०- यत्यपिभजन -क, पुरीयानिजभजन- ख-११- मल -ख- १२- दीपदर्शनमिति -क १३- अस्मिन् इत्यधिक गपुस्तके १४- किंणमुलि -ख-१५-चरति-क-१६-नाति-क,नाहि (?) -ख-१७- भ्रमत्यहो (?) -ख

षडंध्रियत्वदः सदा तदंघ्रिपंकजद्वये[१]
चकोरकीयतु स्थिरं[२] तदानने शशिप्रभे[३] ।।"

अत्रावशिष्टाः षड्विधा अपि लुप्ताः प्रदर्शिताः[४] । तत्र[५] द्वितीयपादे वाक्यसमासयोर्धर्मोपमानलुप्ता द्विविधा[६], तृतीयपादे[७] क्यप्समासयोर्धर्मवाचकलुप्ता द्विविधा, चकोरकीयत्त्विति वाचकोपमेयलुप्ता, शशिप्रभ इति धर्मोपमानवाचकलुप्ता च क्रमेण द्रष्टव्या ।

एवमयं पूर्णालुप्ताविभागो वाक्यसमासप्रत्ययविशेषगोचरतया शब्दशास्त्रव्युत्पादकौशलप्रदर्शनमात्रप्रयोजनो नातीवालंकारशास्त्रे व्युत्पाद्यतामर्हति । न वा लुप्तानामयं सामस्त्येन विभागः । तथाहि- धर्मलुप्ता वाक्यसमासतद्धितेषु दर्शिता । द्विर्भावेऽपि दृश्यते "पटुपटुर्देवदत्तः" इति । अत्र हि "प्रकारे गुणवचनस्य" इति सादृश्ये द्विर्भावविधानात् । पटुसदृश इत्यर्थः । यो हि शास्त्रादिष्वपटुरेव पटुवदभिनयति स उच्यते पटुपटुरिति । न तावदियं वाक्ये धर्मलुप्ता[८] । "कर्मधारयवदुत्तरेषु" इति समाससद्भावविधानेनैकपदसिद्धेः[९] । अत एव न समासेऽपि धर्मलुप्तेयम् । वाचकलुप्ता णिनिं विना कैश्चित्पञ्चधा दर्शिता । णिनिना सहापरैः सप्तविधा । क्यप्तद्धितयोरपि दृश्यते[१०]--

"यद्भक्तानां सुखमयः संसारोऽप्यपवर्गति[११] ।
तं शंभुमजन्मर्त्यश्चञ्चैवात्महिताकृते[१२] ।।"

इति विवृतमेतदधस्तात् । वाक्यसमासयोरुपमानलुप्तापि[१३] दर्शिता । उपनतमेतदकस्मादासीद्धत काकतालीयम्[१४]" इति तद्धितेऽपि[१५] दृश्यते । वाचकोपमानलुप्ता स्वरूपत एव नोदाहृता । सापि काकतालीयमिति प्रकृतिभूते[१६] समासे दृश्यते । धर्मोपमानलुप्तापि तद्धिते काकतालीयमित्यत्र दृश्यते । धर्मवाचकलुप्ता क्यप्समासयोरिव तद्धितेऽपि दृश्यते । "तं जगत्यमजन्मर्त्यश्चञ्चा चन्द्रकलाधरम्" इति हि[१७] प्रागुदाहृतम् । तस्माल्लुप्ताविभागे दिङ्मात्रप्रदर्शनमेवेदं प्राचां न तु सामस्त्येन विभागः । ये चान्ये काव्यालो-

---

१- द्वयो-ख-२- स्थिर-ख ३- शशिप्रभैः (?) -ख ४- दर्शिताःख५- तत्-ख
६- द्वितीया-ख ७- तृतीयापा-ख ८- वाक्यधर्मलुप्ता-ख ९- समासवद्भाव-क,ख,ग
१०- दृश्यते: (?) -ख ११- -वपवर्गति: (?) -ख १२- स्वहिताकृते:-क,ख,ग,
१३- अपि इति क-,गयोः नास्ति १४- दर्शिता इत्यारभ्य आसीद्धत इत्यन्तं खपुस्तके नास्ति किंच तद्धिते इति द्विरावृत्तम् १५- च इत्यधिकं कपुस्तके १६- काकतालीयप्रकृतिभूते-क,ख,ग १७- हि इति गपुस्तके नास्ति ।

कादिषूपमायां प्रकारभेदा दर्शितास्ते सर्वे तेष्वेव द्रष्टव्याः । दर्शिताश्चे-हापि लेशतो लक्षणविचारप्रस्तावे । रूपकप्रकरणे चास्याः प्रकारभेदा-न्कांश्चित्प्रदर्शयिष्याम[१]: ।

पुनश्चेयमुपमा संक्षेपतस्त्रिधा--क्वचित्स्ववैचित्र्यमात्रविश्रान्ता यथा-'स च्छिन्नमूलः क्षतजेन रेणुः' इत्यादौ । क्वचिदुक्तार्थोपपादनपरा यथा--'अनन्तरत्नप्रभवस्य[२]' इत्यादौ । यथा वा---

'विश्रब्धघातदोषः स्ववधाय खलस्य वीरकोपकरः ।
वनतरुभंगध्वनिरिव हरिनिद्रातस्करः करिणः ।।'

क्वचिद्व्यंग्यप्रधाना[३] सा व्यंग्यस्य वस्त्वलंकाररसरूपतया त्रैविध्यात्त्रि-विधा । तत्र वस्तुध्वनिर्यथा--

दर्पान्धगन्धगजकुम्भकपाट[४]कूट[५]-
संक्रान्तिनिघ्नघनशोणितशोणरोचिः[६] ।
वीरैर्व्यलो[७]कि युधि कोपकषायकान्तिः
कालीकटाक्ष इव यस्य करे कृपाणः ।।'

अत्र कृपाणस्य कुपितकालीकटाक्षसादृश्यवर्णनेन सकलरिपुबलक्षयः क्षणादेव करिष्यत इति वस्तु व्यज्यते । अलंकारध्वनिर्यथा--

'यशसि तव विकसिते नृप हिमकरकिरणच्छटा[८]धवले ।
भ्रमर इव पुण्डरीके विराजते विष्णुपदमेतत् ।।'

[९]अत्रोपमालंकारेण यशसः[१०] पुण्डरीकवद्वैपुल्यस्य, गगनस्य च[११] भ्रमरवदल्प-त्वस्य प्रतीतेराश्रयाश्रयिणोरनानुरूप्य[१२]लक्षणोऽधिकालंकारो व्यज्यते ।। रस-ध्वनिः 'वागर्थाविव' इत्यादा[१३]वुदाहृतः ।

क्वचिदेकत्रैव त्रिविधोऽपि ध्वनिर्दृश्यते यथा--

पश्यात्र नलिनीपत्रे बलाका परिदृश्यते ।
हरिन्मणिमये पात्रे शुक्तिकेव प्रतिष्ठिता[१४] ।।'

---

१- दर्शयिष्यामः -क,ख,ग २- 'यस्य हिमं न सौभाग्यविलोपि जातम्' इत्यधिकं गपुस्तके ३- क्वचिद्व्यंग्यप्रधाना-क ४- कवाट-ख ५- कूट-ख ६- शोणशोचिः क,ख,ग ७- वीरैर्व्यर्थलोकि-ख ८- हिमकरणच्छटा- ख-९- च इत्यधिकं गपुस्तके १०-यशसा-ख ११- च इति क-ख-गपुस्तकेषु नास्ति १२- --णोरननुरूप्य-ख १३- इत्यत्र-क,ख,ग १४- प्रतिष्ठितः-ख

किमावयोः संकेतस्थानं भविष्यतीति पृष्टमनसो[1] जनसमदाम[2]पृच्छतश्च प्रच्छन्नकामुकस्याभिप्रायमिंगितेन विदितवत्या विदग्धायाः संकेतस्थान-सूचनार्थमिदं वचनम् । अत्र पद्मपत्रस्थितबलाकाया मरकतपात्रप्रतिष्ठित-शुक्तिकासादृश्यवर्णनेन तस्यास्[3]तद्वन्निश्चलत्वप्रतीतेराश्वस्तत्वं व्यज्यते तेन तत्प्रदेशस्य निर्जनत्वं व्यज्यत इति वस्तुध्वनिः । ततश्च तदेव संकेतस्थान-मावयोरिति प्रकाशनात्[4]संलक्षित तत्सूक्ष्मार्थप्रकाशनरूपसूक्ष्मालंकारध्वनिः । एवं तदभिप्रायानु[5]रूपवर्णनात्परस्परं रतिभावो व्यज्यत[6] इति रसध्वनिश्च ।

ननु रसादिध्वनिरसंलक्ष्य[7]क्रम इति प्रसिद्धिः कथमत्र तस्यानुरणनेन व्यंग्यतोच्यते । नैवम् । यत्र विभावानु[8]भावादिवशादाशु भाविनी रसाभि-व्यक्तिस्तत्रासंलक्ष्यक्रमता । अन्यत्र तु रसादिध्वनिरपि संलक्ष्यक्रम एव । तदुक्तमभिनवगुप्तपादाचार्यैः[9]--'यद्यपि रसभावादिरर्थो ध्वन्यमान एव न वाच्यः कदाचिदपि तथापि न सर्वोऽसंलक्ष्यक्रमस्य विषयः' इति । अत एव ध्वनिकारोऽपि --

'एवंवादिनि देवर्षौ पार्श्वे पितुरधोमुखी ।
लीलाकमलपत्राणि गणयामास पार्वती ।।'

इत्यत्र लज्जाख्यं[10] संचारिभावमनुरणनव्यंग्यमुदाजहार ।

अथोपमाव्यंग्यप्रसंगादुपमाध्वनयः प्रदर्श्यन्ते । तत्र शब्दशक्तिमू-लोपमाध्वनिर्यथा--

'किरति प्रकरं गवां प्रकामं सुमनः स्वच्छतरं निधौ कलानाम् ।
कतिचित्कलयन्ति यत्प्रबोधं कतिचिन्नेति स तत्स्वभाव एव ।।'

एकस्माद्गुरोर्विद्यां[11] शिक्षमाणानां केचित्प्रगल्भन्ते नान्य इति विशेषो बोधकस्य गुरोस्तेषु तेषु बोधनविशेषकृतो न भवति किं तु तत्स्वभावकृत इत्यस्मिन्नर्थे प्रकृतेऽप्रकृतार्थस्योपमानत्वकल्पनया[12]त्रैवमुपमा[13] व्यज्यते। यथा चन्द्रे किरणानां प्रकरमविशेषेण सर्वपुष्पेषु[14] विकिरति[15] कानिचिद्विकसन्ति नान्यानीत्येष विशेषस्तत्तत्पुष्पस्वभावकृत एव न तु चन्द्रस्य किरणवि-

---

१- पृष्टमत्युन्मनसो-क २- इति इत्यधिकं कपुस्तके ३- स्तस्यास्त--क, तस्तद्-ख ४- ससंलक्षित (?) ख- ५- अभिप्रायानुसेधवर्णनात्-ख ६- अभिव्यज्यते-क ७-- क्रमव्यंग्य-क,ख,ग ८- विभावाभावादि--घ ९- पाद इति क-ख-गपुस्तकेषु नास्ति १०- गूढजाख्यं- ख- ११- विधाशिक्ष ख-१२- कल्पनायात्रैवमुपमानाव्यते (?) -ख १३- उपमानत्वं -क,ग १४- सर्वपुष्पेषु इति गपुस्तके नास्ति १५- किरति-क,ग

शेषाकृत[1]: स्वं गुरौ सर्वशिष्येष्वविशेषेण वाङ्मयं विकिरति[2] तेषु बोधाबोधविशेषोऽपि तत्तत्स्वभावकृत स्वेत्यत्र श्लिष्टानां गोसुमनःकलानिधिशब्दानां वागादिपर्यायपरिवृत्त्यसहिष्णुत्वा[3]च्छब्दशक्तिमूलानुरणनरूपध्वनिः ।

अर्थशक्तिमूलो वस्तुनोपमाध्वनिर्यथा--

'वाहि वात यतः कान्ता तां स्पृष्ट्वा मामपि स्पृश ।
त्वयि मे गात्रसंस्पर्श[4]श्चन्द्रे दृष्टिसमागमः ।।'

अत्रार्थशक्त्या चन्द्रे दृष्टिसमागम इत्यनेन चन्द्रे सीतामुखसादृश्यं व्यज्यते । अलंकारेणोपमाध्वनिर्यथा--

'यैर्दृष्टोऽसि तदा[5] ललाटपतितप्रासप्रहारो युधि
स्फीतासृक्स्रुतिपाटलीकृतपुरोभागः परान्दारयन्[6] ।
येषां[7] दुःसहकामदेहदहनप्रोद्भूतनेत्रानल-
ज्वालालीमरभासुरे पुररिपावस्तं गतं कौतुकम् ।।'

अत्रा[8]न्यत्कार्यं प्रकुर्वतोऽशक्यान्यवस्तुकरणा[9]त्मको विशेषालंकारः । उक्तरूपं त्वां पश्यतो यथोक्तविशेषणविशिष्टपुररिपुदर्शनमासीदिति निबन्धनात्कारणस्य क्रियासामान्यात्मनो दर्शनेऽपि सद्भावाद्यद्यप्ययमर्थो न वाच्यस्तथापि तस्मिन्कौतुकास्तमयवर्णनाद्गम्यः । तेन तदा त्वं तथाभूतः पुररिपु[10]रिव स्थितोऽसीत्युपमा व्यज्यते । स्वमुपमादिरुदाहृता ।

अथोपमादोषाश्चिन्त्यन्ते--न्यूनत्वमधिकत्वं लिंगभेदो वचनभेदोऽसादृश्यमसंभव इत्यस्याः षड् दोषानाहुः । तत्रोपमेयादुपमानस्यापकृष्टत्वं न्यूनत्वम् । उत्कृष्टत्वमाधिक्यम् । द्वयमपि जात्या प्रमाणेन धर्मतो वेति प्रत्येकं त्रिविधम् । तत्र जातिप्रमाणगतन्यूनत्वाधिक्ये यथा--

'चण्डालैरिव युष्माभिः साहसं परमं कृतम् ।'
'वह्निस्फुलिंग इव भानुरयं चकास्ति ।'
'अयं पद्मासनासीन[11]श्चक्रवाको विराजते ।
युगादौ भगवान्वेधा विनिर्मित्सुरिव प्रजाः ।।'

---

१- किरणविकरणविशेष--क, किरणविविकरण--ग २- विकरति-क
३- परिवृत्तिसहिष्णुत्वात्-ख- ४- प्रातसंस्पर्शः-ख ५- तथा-क-६- दारयत्-ख
७- तेषां-क ८- अत्रासत्-ख-९- वस्तुकरणको-ग १०- पुरःरिपुव-क-११-
पद्मसमासीन -ख

"पातालमिव नाभिस्ते पर्वताविव च स्तनौ ।
वेणिदण्डः पुनरयं कालिन्दीपातसंनिभः ।।"

अत्र चण्डालादिभिरूपमानैः प्रस्तुतोऽर्थोऽत्यन्तमेव कदर्थित इत्यनुचितार्थतायामिमे न्यूनत्वाधिक्ये पर्यवस्यतः । धर्मतो न्यूनत्वाधिक्ये तु हीनाधिकपदत्वरूपौ दोषौ । यथा--

"स मुनिर्लाञ्छितो मौञ्ज्या कृष्णाजिनपट्टं[१]वहन् ।
व्यराजन्नीलजीमूतभागाश्लिष्ट इवांशुमान् ।।"

"स पीतवासाः प्रगृहीतशार्ङ्गो मनोज्ञभीमं वपुराप कृष्णः ।
शतह्रदेन्द्रायुधवान्निशायां संसृज्यमानः शशिनेव मेघः ।।"

अत्राद्य उपमानस्य मौञ्ज[२]प्रतिबिम्बस्तडिल्लक्षणधर्मो न निबद्ध इति न्यूनत्वम् । द्वितीये उपमेयस्य शंखादेरनिर्देशेन शशिनो[३] ग्रहणमतिरिच्यत इत्याधिक्यम् । लिंगवचनभेदो[४] यथा--

"भाग्याभावात्करस्थोऽपि चिन्तारत्नमिव च्युतः ।
सक्तवो भक्षिता देव[५] शुद्धाः कुलवधूरिव ।।"

इमौ प्रक्रमभंगान्तर्भूतौ । कथं च्युतत्वादिरत्र साधारणधर्मो भवितुं नार्हति । उपमानोपमेययोर्मध्ये यत्र लिंगवचनसारूप्यं तत्रैवास्य समन्वयेनोभयान्वयाभावात् । तथा चोपात्तविशेषणविशिष्टस्यैवोपमानत्वमुपमेयत्वं वा भवेत् । प्रतीयमानेन तु धर्मान्तरेणोपमा[६] निर्वाह्या स्यात् । ततश्चोपमानोपमेययोः कस्यचित्सविशेषणत्व[७]मन्यस्य नेत्येवं[८] विशेषणप्रक्रमभंगरूपता ।

केचित्तु कालपुरुषलोडर्थादिभेदमपि दोषमाहुः । यथा--[९]

"तस्यापनोदाय फलप्रवृत्तावुपस्थितायामपि निर्व्यपेक्षः ।
त्यक्ष्यामि वैदेहसुतां पुरस्तात्समुद्रनेमिं पितुराज्ञयेव ।।"

अत्र समुद्रनेमिमत्यजमित्यन्वेति न तु त्यक्ष्यामीति । पुरुषभेदो यथा--

"शरीरमात्रेण नरेन्द्र तिष्ठन्नाभासि तीर्थप्रतिपादितर्द्धिः ।
आरण्यकोपात्तफलप्रसूतिः स्तम्बेन नीवार इवावशिष्टः ।।"

नीवारे आभातीत्यन्वेति न त्वाभासीति ।

---

१- पदं -ख २- मौञ्जीप्रति-- क,ख,ग ३- शशिग्रहणम्-क ४- भेदौ-क ५- देवि ख ६-- नोपमा निर्वाह्या -घ - ७- विशेषण-- ग-८- नेत्यर्थविशेषण--क,ख,ग ९- तथा- ख

विध्यादिभेदो यथा--

"आशास्यमन्यत्पुनरुक्तभूतं श्रेयांसि सर्वाण्यधिजग्मुषस्ते ।

पुत्रं लभस्वात्मगुणानुरूपं भवन्तमीड्यं[1] भवतः पितेव ।।"

भवन्तमलभतेत्यन्वेति न तु लभस्वेत्याशीः[2] । असादृश्यासंभवावुपमाया-[3 मा]

मनुचितार्थतायां पर्यवस्यतः । असादृश्यं[4] यथा---

"गृह्णामि[5] काव्यशशिनं विततार्थरश्मिम् ।"

काव्यस्य शशिना सादृश्यमप्रसिद्धम् । यद्यर्थानां रश्मीनां च सादृश्यं

प्रसिद्धं[6] स्यात्तदा तदीयबिम्बप्रतिबिम्बभावेन काव्यशशिनोः सादृश्यमप्र-

सिद्धमप्यानीयेत न च तदप्यस्ति । यथा वा--

"एष विन्ध्याचलः सान्द्रकुंजोल्लसितनिर्झरः[7] ।

भालेक्षणस्फुरद्वह्निशिखाटोप इवेश्वरः ।।

असंभवो यथा --

निपेतुरास्यादिव[8] तस्य दीप्ताः शरा[9] धनुर्मण्डलमध्यभाजः ।

जाज्वल्यमाना इव वारिधारा दिनार्धभाजः परिवेषिणोऽर्कात् ।

ज्वलन्त्योऽम्बुधाराः सूर्यमण्डलान्निष्पतन्त्यो[10] न संभवन्तीत्यसंभवः ।

केचिदुपमानाप्रसिद्धिं[11] पृथग्दोषमाहुः । यथा--

बाष्पदिग्धेक्षणं[12] वक्त्रं तरुण्याः परिदृश्यते ।

तुषारसिक्तच्छदनं तरंगिण्या इवोत्पलम् ।।"

अत्र बाष्पदिग्धेक्षणं तुषारसिक्तच्छदनमित्यनयोर्बिम्बप्रतिबिम्बभावेन

सादृश्यसंभवेऽप्युत्पलस्य मुखं प्रत्युपमानत्वाप्रसिद्धिरेव दोषः ।

अथैषां दोषाणां यथासंभवमपवादाः प्रदर्श्यन्ते - कविसमयसंमतेषु[ग][13]

जात्या प्रमाणेन च न्यूनत्वाधिक्ये न दोषौ । यथा--

"तवाननसमश्चन्द्रश्चन्द्रतुल्यं त्वदाननम् ।

श्वणकं मध्यसदृशं मध्यं श्वणकसंनिभम् ।।"

---

१- मीड्यो-ग २- आशी-क ३- अत्र सादृश्यसंभवादुपमाया अनु--ख, (३)- अत्र सादृश्यसंभवादुपमाया--ग ४- असादृश्य ख- ५- गृह्णामि-ख- ६- प्रसिद्धम् इत्यारभ्य सान्द्र इत्यन्तं ख पुस्तके नास्ति ७- कुंजोच्चलित-क,ख,ग ८- निष्पेतुः-ख-९- शरा-क,ख,ग१०- निष्पतत्यो-क ११- प्रसिद्धं-ख १२- वाष्पादिग्धे--ख १३- --समतेषु-क

अत्र कविसमयप्रसिद्धेर्न किंचिदनौचित्यम् । उपमेयोपमानगताधिक-धर्मोपादानस्यैकैकधर्मकानेकोपमार्थत्वेन वा साधारणधर्मवत्तासंपादनार्थत्वेन वा धर्मिस्वरूपविशेषलाभार्थत्वेन वा विधानान्तरेण[१] वा प्रस्तुतकार्यान्तरार्थत्वे[२] धर्मतो न्यूनत्वाधिक्ये[३] न दोषौ । यथा--

'क्षीरोदवेलेव सफेनपुंजा पर्याप्तचन्द्रेव[४] शरत्त्रियामा ।
नवं[५] नवं धामनिवासिनी सा भूयो बभौ दर्पणमादधाना ।।'

इत्यत्रोपमेयगताधिकविशेषणोपादानस्यैकैकविशेषणकानेकोपमानार्थत्वात् ।

'क्षीरोदवेला च सफेनपुंजा पर्याप्तचन्द्रा च शरत्त्रियामा ।
अनुव्यधात्धामनिवासिनीं तामच्छप्रभं दर्पणमादधानाम् ।।'

इत्यस्यैव श्लोकस्य पाठे[६] उपमानगतानेकधर्मोपादानमेकैकधर्मकोपमानु-[७]यार्थमित्युपमानस्य धर्मतं आधिक्यान्न[८] दोषः ।

इति विज्ञापितो राज्ञा ध्यानस्तिमितलोचनः ।
क्षणमात्रमृषिस्तस्थौ सुप्तमीन इव ह्रदः ।।

अत्र विज्ञापितविशेषणं ध्यानस्तिमितलोचन इति साधारणधर्मवत्तासं-पादनार्थमिति न्यूनत्वं न दोषः ।

ज्यानिनादमभिगृह्णती तयोः प्रादुरास बहुलक्षपाछविः ।
ताडका[९] चलकपालकुण्डला[१०] कालिकेव निबिडा बलाकिनी ।।

अत्र निबिडेति विशेषणं कालिकाया बहुलक्षपाछविरिति साधारण-धर्मवत्तासंपादनार्थमित्याधिक्यं न दोषः ।

'अतिथिं नाम काकुत्स्थात्पुत्रमाप कुमुद्वती ।
पश्चिमाद्यामिनीयामात्प्रसादमिव चेतना ।।'

अत्रातिथिं[११] नामेति विशेषणं धर्मिस्वरूपविशेषलाभार्थमिति[१२] न्यूनत्वं[१३] न दोषः ।

'रसान्तराण्येकरसं[१४] यथा दिव्यं पयोऽश्नुते ।
देशे[१५] देशे गुणेष्वेवमवस्थास्त्वमविक्रियः[१६] ।।'

---

१- विधान्तरेण-क,ख,घ, विधान्तरार्थत्वेन-ग २- प्रस्तुतकालान्तरा--ख
३- न्यूनत्वाधिको-ख ४- पर्याप्तचन्द्रेव-ख ५- नवम् इत्यारभ्य अनुव्यधात् इत्यन्तं खपुस्तके नास्ति ६- पाठो (?) क ७- उपमासत्तुगता--ख ८- आधिक्यं न दोषः-क,ख,ग, ९- ताटका-क,--तारका-ख १०--कुण्डलो-ख ११-अत्रातिथिनाम-ख
१२- स्वरग-क,ग १३- आधिक्यं-घ १४- -ण्येकरस-ख १५- काले-ख १६-मवस्था त्वमिविक्रियः-ग

अत्र दिव्यमिति विशेषणं धर्मिविशेषलाभार्थमित्यधिकत्वं न दोषः। एवं प्रकृतकथासंघटनचमत्कारादिकार्यान्तरत्वेऽपि[1] द्रष्टव्यम्[2]। एवं च प्रस्तुतकार्यान्तरोपयोगरहितानां बिम्बप्रतिबिम्बभावेऽपि[3] [4] साधारणधर्मैकप्रयोजनतया[5] संभाव्यमानानामुपमेयोपमानविशेषणानां प्रतिविशेषणा*निर्देश एव न्यूनत्वमधिकत्वं च दोषः।

कार्यान्तरार्थानामप्यनुगामिनामतया[6] विशेषणनिर्देशेन वा साधारणीकरणे त्वधिको गुणः। यथा--"ज्यानिनादमभिगृह्णती-" इति श्लोके ज्यानिनादमभिगृह्णतीत्युपमेयविशेषणं ताड़का[7] स्वयमेव जिघांसया प्रादुर्भूय प्रथममभिद्रुतवती रामेण हतेति स्त्रीवधानौचित्यपरिहारार्थत्वेऽप्युपमानसाधारणम्। कालिकायामपि गर्जितशालिन्यामतिशयोक्त्या तद्विशेषणानुवृत्तेः। तथा --"नृपं तमावर्त -[8]" इति श्लोके "अन्यवधूर्भवित्री" इत्यस्य व्यतिक्रमणार्थत्वेऽपि सागरगामिनीति तत्प्रतिविशेषणनिर्देशः कृतः।

यत्र लिंगवचनभेदेऽपि सामान्याभिधायिपदं स्वरूपभेदं नापद्यते तत्र न दोषः उभयानुगतिक्षमत्वात्[9]। यथा--"भीमकान्तैर्नृपगुणैः"।

तद्देशोऽसदृशोऽन्याभिः स्त्रीभिर्मधुरताभृतः[10]।
दधते स्म परां शोभां तदीया विभ्रमा इव॥"

सामान्याभिधायिपदस्य स्वरूपभेदापत्तावपि लिंगवचनभेदो महाकविप्रयोगेषु दृश्यते।

"द्वेष्योऽपि संमतः शिष्टस्तस्यार्तस्य यथौषधम्।
त्याज्यो दुष्टः प्रियोऽप्यासीदंगुलीवोरगक्षता॥"
"प्रवृद्धो हीयते चन्द्रः समुद्रोऽपि तथाविधः।
स तु तत्समवृद्धिश्च न चाभूताविव[11] दायी॥"

इत्यादौ। कालादिभेदे तु भूयांस्युदाहरणानि। एतादृशेषु[12] लोकसिद्धत्वाल्लिंगादिभेदो न दोषः" इति वामनः। एवं गुणदोषव्यवस्थायां सहृदयहृदयमेव प्रमाणम्। उक्तं हि दण्डिना --

---

१- "तत्र तत्र" इत्यधिकं क-ख-ग पुस्तकेषु २- द्रष्टव्यम् इत्यारभ्य उपमान"
(४ र्थ प०) इत्यन्तं खपुस्तके नास्ति ३- भावेन-क,ग-४- न इति ख-घयोः अधिकम्।
५- -- धर्मतयैक-क-६- नाम इति गपुस्तके नास्ति ७- ताटका-क,ख
८- गभीरनाभिः इत्यधिकं गपुस्तके ९- तयत्वात्-क १०- तावृत--ख ११- चाभूताविव-ख
१२- उपमासु इत्याधिकं कपुस्तके
* प्रतिविशेषणानिर्देशा- घ

'न लिंगवचने भिन्ने न हीनाधिकते[1] अपि ।
उपमादूषणायालं[2] यत्रोद्वेगो न धीमताम् ।।
स्त्रीव गच्छति षण्ढोऽयं वक्त्येषा स्त्री पुमानिव ।
प्राणा इव प्रियोऽयं मे विधा[3] धनमिवार्जिता ।।
भवानिव महीपाल देवराजो विराजते ।
अलमंशुमत: कक्षामारोढुं तेजसा नृप: ।।
इत्येवमादि सौभाग्यं न जहात्येव जातुचित् ।
अस्ति च कश्चिदुद्वेग: प्रयोगे वाग्विदां यथा ।।
हंसीव धवलश्चन्द्र: सरांसीवामलं[4] नभ: ।
भर्तृभक्तो भट: श्वेव खद्योतो भाति भानुवत् ।।
ईदृशं वर्ज्यते सद्भि: कारणं तत्र चिन्त्यताम् ।' इति ।

कविसमयप्रसिद्धौ सत्यामसादृश्यं न दोष: यथा--'चन्द्रधवला कीर्ति:' इत्यादौ । उपमेयगतासंभावितत्वविवक्षायामुपमानस्यासंभवो[5] न दोषाय[6] । यथा--'चन्द्रबिम्बादिव विषम्' इत्यादौ । श्लिष्टसाधारणधर्मायामन्यत्रापि सहृदयहृदयाह्लादिन्यां कल्पितोपमानायामुपमायामप्रसिद्धत्वं[7] न दोष: । यथा--

'कविमतिरिव बहुलोहा सुघटितचक्रा[8] प्रभातवेलेव[9] ।
हरमूर्तिरिव हसन्ती भाति विधूमानलोपेता ।।'

'सद्यो मुण्डितमत्तहूणचिबुकप्रस्पर्द्धि नारंगकम्' इत्यादौ । एवमन्येऽपि दोषापवादप्रकारा विद्वद्भिश्चिन्तनीया: ।।

इति चित्रमीमांसायामुपमाप्रकरणम् ।

---

अथोपमेयोपमा निरूप्यते--

उपमानोपमेयत्वं द्वयो: पर्यायतो यदि ।
उपमेयोपमा सा स्याद्[6]द्विविधैषा प्रकीर्तिता ।।

यदि द्वयोर्वर्ण्यते सोपमेयोपमेत्युच्यते तदा तुल्ययोगितायामतिव्याप्ति: । तत्र ----

---

१- हीन इति खपुस्तके नास्ति २-- दूषणायात्-ख ३- विद्या धनमिवा-- घ-४- सरांसीवामलं-ख ५- अभावो-क-६- दोष:-ख-७- कल्पितायामुपमायामप्रसिद्धत्वं क,ख-८- सुघटितचन्द्रा-ख९- प्रभातवलेव-ख

'जनस्य तस्मिन्समये विगाढे बभूवतुर्द्वौ सविशेषकान्तौ ।

तापापनोदक्षमपादसेवौ स चोदयस्थौ नृपतिः शशी च ।।'

इति द्वयोर्नृपशशिनोर्युगपदेकधर्मान्वय[१]वर्णनात् । अतः पर्यायेणेत्युक्तम् ।

तथापि--

'तस्य द्विपानां मदवारि[२]सेकात्खुराभिघाताच्च तुरंगमाणाम् ।

रेणुः प्रपेदे पथि पंकभावं पंकोऽपि रेणुत्वमियाय भूयः ।।'

इत्यत्रातिव्याप्तिः । तत्र रेणुपंकयोः पर्यायेण पंकरेणुभाववर्णनात् । अत उपमानोपमेयत्वमित्युक्तम् । द्वयोर्यदुपमानोपमेयत्वं वर्ण्यते सोपमेयोपमेत्युक्तेऽपि- 'व्युष्टं[३] प्रयाणं[४] च वियोगवेदनाविदूननारीकमभूत्समं[५] तदा' इत्युभयविश्रान्तसादृश्यायामु[६]पमायामतिव्याप्तिः । न च तत्रोभयोरपि सादृश्याश्रयत्वरूपस्योपमेयत्वस्यैव प्रतिपादनमस्ति न सादृश्यप्रतियोगित्वरूप[७]स्योपमानत्वस्यातो नातिव्याप्तिरिति वाच्यम् । मुखतः प्रतिपादनाभावेऽपि तयोः परस्परमुपमानत्व[८]स्यार्थात्प्रतीतेः । न ह्युपमानोपमेयत्वं यत्र[९] वाच्यमिति लक्षणे विवक्षितम् । व्यंग्योपमेयोपमासंग्रहाभावप्रसंगात् । अतः पर्यायेणेत्युक्तम् । एवमपि- 'भणितिरिव मतिर्मतिरिव चेष्टा' इत्यादि[१०]रसनोपमायां मतिचेष्टयोः पर्यायभेदेनोपमानत्वस्योपमेयत्वस्य च सत्त्वेनातिव्याप्तिपरिहारायैकस्मिन्पर्याये यं प्रत्युपमानत्वं तं प्रत्येव पर्यायान्तरे उपमेयत्वं विवक्षणीयम् ।

द्विविधे[११]त्युक्तम् । द्वैविध्यं धर्मस्य साधारण्यवस्तुप्रतिवस्तुभावाभ्याम् ।

'सुगन्धि नयनानन्दि मदिरामदपाटलम् ।

अम्भोजमिव ते वक्त्रं त्वद्वक्त्रमिव पंकजम् ।।'

'स्वच्छायाम्भोजवदनाः स्वच्छायवदनाम्बुजाः ।

वाप्योऽङ्गना इवाभान्ति[१२] यत्र वाप्य इवाङ्गनाः ।।'

इति क्रमेणोदाहरणे ।

अत्रेदं विचार्यते । लक्षणस्य[१३] त्वद्वल्गुना युगपदुन्मिषितेन तावत्' इति

---

१- धर्मान्वये इति खपुस्तके द्विरावृत्तम २- मत्वारिसेकात्-ख-३- प्रमाणं -क(?) घ ४- त्वं-क-५- समम् इति खपुस्तके नास्ति ६- सादृश्योपमायाम् -ख ७- गित्वरूपम्-ग ८- सुपमानस्यार्थात्-ग ९- तत्र-ग १०- -रशनो--क, शरोपमा (?) -ख ११- सद्विधवेत्युक्तम्-क १२- भाति-ख २३- त्वद्वल्गुना-घ.

प्रागुदाहृतायां युगपदुपमेयोपमायामव्याप्ति: । न चेयमुपमेयोपमा न भवति, किं तूभयविश्रान्तोपमामात्रमिति शंकनीयम् । परस्परतुलामित्यनेन द्वयोरपि प्रतियोगित्वस्यापि प्रतिपाद्यमानतया उपमेयोपमेत्यन्वयार्थस्याविशिष्टत्वात् । अर्थादपि सिध्यत: परस्परप्रतियोगित्वस्य मुखत: प्रतिपादनेन तृतीयसदृशव्यवच्छेदरूपफललाभाच्च । किं च 'रजोभि: स्यन्दनोद्धूतै:[१]' इति प्रागुदाहृतायां परस्परोपमायामतिव्याप्ति: । न च तत्राप्युपमेयोपमा । तृतीयसदृशव्यवच्छेदाप्रतीते: । 'द्विविधैषा प्रकीर्तिते'ति विभागासामञ्जस्य[२]प्रसंगाच्च । न ह्यत्र धर्मस्य साधारण्यं वस्तुप्रतिवस्तुभावो वास्ति । गगनस्य भूतलेन सादृश्ये रजोव्याप्तत्वं साधारणधर्म: । भूतलस्य गगनेन सादृश्ये गजानां मेघानां च बिम्बप्रतिबिम्बभाव इत्यत्यन्तविलक्षणत्वात् । अत एवात्र तृतीयसब्रह्मचारिव्यवच्छेदरूपं फलम[३]पि न सिध्यति । एकधर्माश्रयेण परस्परसाम्ये[४] वर्ण्यमाने ह्यनयोरस्मिन्विषये तृतीय: सब्रह्मचारी नास्तीति फलति । कस्यचित्केनचित्सादृश्ये वर्णिते तस्याप्यन्येन सादृश्यमर्थसिद्धमपि मुखतो वर्ण्यमानं तृतीयसदृशव्यवच्छेदार्थं भवतीति हि तत्फलकत्वे बीजम् । न चैतद्धर्मसाधारण्य इव धर्मभेदेऽपि लभ्यते । रजोभिर्गगनस्य भूतलसादृश्यवर्णनेन भूतलस्य मेघाकारैर्गजैर्गगनसादृश्यस्यार्थत: सिद्ध्यभावात् ।

अपि च--

'पितासमाराधनतत्परेण पुत्रेण[५] पुत्री स यथैव तेन ।
पुत्रस्तथैवाधिकवत्सलेन स तेन पित्रा पितृमान्बभूव ।।'

इति व्यत्यस्तधर्मिबिम्बप्रतिबिम्बकोपमायामतिव्याप्ति[६]: । अत्र हि पुत्र: पिता चेत्युभावुपमेयोपमानभूतौ धर्मिणौ । तयोस्तावेव व्यत्यासेन पितृमत्त्वं पुत्रित्वमिति साधारणधर्मकोटिप्रविष्टतयोपात्तौ[७] । तयोश्च बिम्बप्रतिबिम्बरूपसाधारण्यापादको[८] धर्मो मतुबिनिप्रत्ययोपात्तं प्राशस्त्यम् । प्रशंसायां ह्यत्र[९] तौ प्रत्ययौ पित्रा पितृमानिति संबन्धमात्रस्यावक्तव्यत्वात्[१०] । एवं च

---

१- स्यन्दनोद्भूतै: घ- २ विभागासामर्थ्य-ख- ३- फलमपि न सिध्यति-ख ४- साधर्म्ये-ग ५- सपुस्तके पुत्रेण- तेन इत्यंश: छिन्नावृत: ६- प्रतिबिम्ब इति खपुस्तके नास्ति ७- योपात्तयोश्च-ख ८- प्रतिबिम्बभावरूप-ख ९- अन्यत्र-ख १०- स्याव्यक्तत्वात्-ग

पुत्रस्य पितुश्च प्रशस्तपितृमत्त्वं प्रशस्तपुत्रवत्त्वं[1] च बिम्बप्रतिबिम्बकरम्बितेन वस्तुप्रतिवस्तुभावेन साधारणधर्म इति लभ्यते । तयोश्च पितापुत्रयोः प्राशस्त्यप्रतिपादके अधिकवत्सलेन समाराधनतत्परेणेति च विशेषणे । ततश्च धर्म्युपमायां यः पिता पुत्रस्योपमानं स एव तस्य तदुपपादके बिम्बप्रतिबिम्बनिर्देशे[2] उपमेय इति लक्षणस्य[3] वर्तनं तावत्स्पष्टम् । न चेयमुपमेयोपमा । पुत्रपित्रोर्धर्मिणोरुपमायां प्रशस्तपितृमत्त्वं प्रशस्तपुत्रवत्त्वं च वस्तुप्रतिवस्तुभावेन बिम्बप्रतिबिम्बभावकरम्बितेन साधारणो धर्मः । पितापुत्रयोस्तु धर्मकोटिनिविष्टयोर्वात्सल्यभक्त्यतिशयकृतं प्राशस्त्यमनुगतसाधारणधर्म इति पूर्वोदाहरणसारूप्यात्समुच्चयोपमया पुत्रोऽपि पितृभक्त्या प्रशस्तः पितापि पुत्रवात्सल्येन प्रशस्त इत्यर्थलाभेऽपि तृतीयसब्रह्मचारिव्यवच्छेदालाभश्च । न चात्र इवशब्दद्वयादियुक्तपर्यायद्वयाभावात्पर्यायविशेषणेनैवातिव्याप्तिनिरासः स्यादिति वाच्यम् । वाच्यकक्षायां पुत्रपित्रोरुपमा व्यंग्यकक्षायां[4] पितापुत्रयोरिति पर्यायद्वयसत्त्वात्[5] । न हि पर्यायद्वयस्यापि वाच्यत्वमत्र विवक्षितम् । येनेवशब्दद्वययुक्तपर्यायद्वयाभावादतिव्याप्तिर्निरस्येत । तथा सति हि व्यंग्योपमेयोपमासाधारण्यं न स्यादित्युक्तम् । न चात्र धर्मिणोरेवोपमा धर्मयोस्तु उपमानोपमेयसाधारण्यार्थमभेद[6] एव प्रतीयते नोपमेति वाच्यम् -

नलिन्या इव तन्वंग्यास्तस्याः पद्ममिवाननम् ।
मया मधुकरेणेव पायं पायमतृप्यत ।।

इत्यादौ बिम्बप्रतिबिम्बभावापन्नयोस्तन्वीनलिन्यादिकयोरुपमाया अपि दर्शनेन धर्मयोः सादृश्येन साधारणीकरणस्याप्युपमाप्रयोजकत्वात् । तस्मात्तत्रातिव्याप्तिशंका दुर्वारा । अतोऽनुपपन्नमेवेदं[7] लक्षणं लक्ष्यते । अत्र ब्रूमः --

अन्योन्येनोपमा बोध्या व्यक्त्या वृत्त्यन्तरेण वा ।
एकधर्माश्रया या स्यात्सोपमेयोपमा मता ।।

अन्योन्येति[8] विशेषणान्न रशनोपमायामतिव्याप्तिः । व्यक्त्या वृत्त्य-

---

१- प्रशस्तपुत्रवत्त्वम्, इति सपुस्तके नास्ति २- बिम्बनिर्देशे-ख ३- लक्षणवर्तनं-क
४- पुत्रपित्रोरुपमा व्यंग्यकक्षायां इति सपुस्तके नास्ति ५- --शब्दद्वययुक्तद्वयाभावादतिव्याप्तिः -क, --शब्दादिद्वयाभावा--ख ६- उपमनोप--ख, ७---मिवेदं ख-
८- विशेषणात् । नाशनोपमाया-ख

न्तरेण वा बोध्येति विशेषणाच्च नोभयविश्रान्तसादृश्योपमायामतिव्याप्तिः । परस्परप्रति[1]दी[2]पकविकल्पार्थेन वाकारेण हि या परस्परप्रतियोगिकत्वविशिष्टोपमा तद्विषयवृत्त्यन्तरनिरपेक्ष[3]व्यक्तिबोध्या तद्विषयव्यक्तिनिरपेक्षवृत्त्यन्तरबोध्या वा भवति सोपमेयोपमेति पर्यवस्यति । ततश्[4]चोभयविश्रान्तसादृश्योपमायामन्योन्यप्रतियोगिकत्वांशे व्यक्तिः सादृश्यरूपोपमांशे वृत्त्यन्तरमिति तयोः कदम्बितत्वान्नातिव्याप्तिशंका । सामान्यलक्षणसिद्[5]ध्यर्थं च व्यक्तिवृत्त्यन्तरयोरन्योन्यत्वेन क्रोडीकृतयोर्ग्रहणम् । एवं हि तया गृहीतं "तु मृगांगनाभ्यः" इत्यत्र वृत्त्यन्तरापेक्ष[5]व्यक्तिबोध्यायामनलंकारभूतायां व्यक्तिनिरपेक्षवृत्त्यन्तरबोध्यायामलंकारभूतायां चोपमा[6]यां लक्षणमनुगतं भवति । यद्यपि व्यंग्यायामप्युपमेयोपमायां शब्दस्य सहकारित्वेन तद्गतशक्तेरप्यपेक्षितत्वात् "खमिव जलं जलमिव खम्" इत्यादौ वाच्यायामपि गम्यसाधारणधर्मायां तस्या[7]ं धर्मांशे व्यक्तेरपेक्षितत्वात्परस्परनैरपेक्ष्यमसं[8]भवि, तथाप्यन्योन्यप्रतियोगिकत्वविशिष्टसादृश्यविषयवृत्त्यन्तरनिरपेक्ष[9]त्वं व्यक्तेः तद्विषयव्यक्तिनिरपेक्षत्वं वृत्त्यन्तरस्य चास्त्येव । इदमेव च व्यक्तिपदानपेक्षयालंकाररूपाया विशेषलक्षणमपि । तत्र व्यक्तिपदपरित्यागे वृत्त्यन्तरमात्रबोध्येत्येतद्विशेषणं पर्यवस्यति । ततश्चोभयविश्रान्तसादृश्योपमाव्यावृत्तिः । न च तस्यामेकस्यैवोपमानत्वं न तु द्वयोरित्यन्योन्यपदेनैव व्यावृत्ताविदं व्यर्थमिति वाच्यम् । प्राकरणि[10]काप्राकरणिकयोः सादृ[11]श्यवर्णने प्राकरणिकस्यैवोपमानत्वलाभेऽप्युभयोरपि प्राकरणिकत्वे विनिगमनाविरहेण परस्परोपमानत्वप्रतीतेः । एवं धर्मा[12]श्रयविशेषणात् "रजोभिः स्यन्दनोत्कीर्णैः" इ[13]ति परस्परोपमायां नातिव्याप्तिः । उक्तविशेषणबलादेव "पिता

[illegible]

समाराधनतत्परेण" इत्युपमायामपि नातिव्याप्तिः । उभयत्राप्युपमेययोर्भिन्न[14]धर्माश्रयत्वात् । एकधर्माश्रयेत्यस्य चायमर्थः । कस्यचिद्[d]येनोपमायां यो धर्मः साधारणो वस्तुप्रतिवस्तुभावापन्नो वा स एवान्यस्य तेनोपमायामपीति । न त्वनुगामिधर्माश्रयेत्यर्थः । बिम्बप्रतिबिम्बगर्भवस्तुप्रतिवस्तुभावनिर्देशे[15] तदभावादिति दिक् ।

इदं तूपमेयोपमात्वप्रयोजकं[16] लक्षणम् । अनुगतानतिप्रसक्तलक्षणं तु[17]-

---

१- "तत्र" इत्यधिकं गपुस्तके २- परस्परद्योपक --ख ३- वृत्त्यन्तरपेक्ष्य-ख ४- ततश्च इत्यारभ्य पर्यवस्यति (१६ प०) इत्यन्तं खपुस्तके नास्ति ५- वृत्त्यन्तरनिरपेक्ष--क ६- चोपमेयोपमायां-क ७- तस्या क--८- असंभवति -क- ९- निरपेक्षत्वं-क १०- प्राकरणिकः प्राकरणिकयोः--ख ११- तादृश्य--ख १२- एकधर्माश्रयविशेष---क १३- इत्यत्र-क १४- -प्युपमेयोर्भि--ख १५- निर्देश-ख १६- प्रयोजकलक्षणं -ख १७- लक्षणमात्रं तु-क,ख,ग

'सदृशस्य तृतीयस्य व्यवच्छेदाय यद्[1]भवेत् ।
अन्योन्येनोपमेयत्वं[2] सोपमेयोपमा मता ।।'

इति द्रष्टव्यम् । अत्रान्योन्येनेति विशेषणं 'अहेमव गृहः सुदारूणानाम्' इति प्रतीपविशेषव्यावृत्त्यर्थम् ।

अथोदाहरणानि । तत्र धर्मस्य साधारण्ये[3] यथा--

'खमिव जलं जलमिव खं हंसश्चन्द्र इव हंस इव चन्द्रः ।
कुमुदाकारास्तारास्ताराकाराणि कुमुदानि ।।'

इयं प्रतीयमानसाधारणधर्मा । वाच्यसाधारणधर्मा यथा---'सुगन्धि नयनानन्दि' इत्यादि ।

यथा वा--

'गिरिरिव गजराजोऽयं गजराज इवोच्चकैर्विभाति गिरिः ।
निर्झर इव मदधारा मदधारेवास्य निर्झरः स्रवति ।।'

अत्रोपमेयोपमाद्वयस्य परस्परानुगृहीतत्वेन विच्छित्तिविशेषोऽधिकः ।
वस्तुप्रतिवस्तुभावो[4] यथा--'सच्छायाम्भोजवदना' इत्यादि ।
इदं वस्तुप्रतिवस्तुभावस्य बिम्बप्रतिबिम्बविशेषणत्वे उदाहरणम् । तद्विशेष्यत्वे यथा--

'वक्त्रं पद्ममिवैतस्या नेत्रं[5] भृंगमनोहरम् ।
पद्मं वक्त्रमिवाभाति भृंगलोचनभूषितम्[6] ।।'

एतानि पर्यायोपमेयोपमोदाहरणानि । युगपदुपमेयोपमोदाहरणं तु-तद्वल्गुना युगपदुन्मिषितेन[7] इत्यादि ।

तत्रापि यथासंभवं पूर्वोक्ता भेदा[8] उन्नेयाः ।।

इत्युपमेयोपमाप्रकरणम्[9] ।

---

अथानन्वयः --

एकस्यैवोपमानोपमेयत्वेऽनन्वयो मतः ।

एवकारबलादेकस्यामेवोपमिति[10]क्रियायामिति गम्यते । तेनोपमेयोपमायां रसनोपमायां च नातिव्याप्तिः । उदाहरणम्--गगनं गगनाकारं

---

१- यद्द्वयोः-क,ख, २- उपमानोपमेयत्व-ख ३- साधारण्ये इत्यारभ्य प्रतीयमान इत्यन्तं ख पुस्तके नास्ति ४- भावे-क ५- नेत्र-क,ख ६- भृंगलोचन-ख ७- युगपदुन्मिषितेन इति खपुस्तके नास्ति ८- पूर्वोक्तभेदा यथासंभवमुन्नेयाः क ९- चित्रमीमांसायाम् इत्यधिकं गपुस्तके १०- वोपमिति ख

सागर: सागरोपम:[1] । अयं प्रतीयमानधर्म: । निर्दिष्टधर्मो यथा--

'न केवलं भाति[2] नितान्तकान्तिर्नितम्बिनी[3] सैव नितम्बिनीव ।
यावद्विलासायुधलास्यवासास्ते[4][5] तद्विलासा इव तद्विलासा: ।।

ननु--

'पितुर्नियोगाद्वनवासमेवं[6] निस्तीर्य राम: प्रतिपन्नराज्य: ।
धर्मार्थकामेषु समां[7] प्रपेदे यथा तथैवावरजेषु वृत्तिम् ।।'

इत्यत्रैकस्यैव रघुपतेरुपमानत्वमुपमेयत्वं[8] च । न च तत्रानन्वय: । समुच्चयोपमया तस्य धर्मार्थकामेष्वनुजेषु च समवृत्तिमात्रस्यैव प्रतिपाद्यतया सदृशान्तरव्यवच्छेदे तात्पर्याभावात् । तथा त्यक्ष्यामि वैदेहसुतां पुरस्तात् समुद्रनेमिं पितुराज्ञयेव' इत्यत्राप्यस्ति स्वस्यैवोपमानत्वमुपमेयत्वं च । तत्रापि नानन्वय: ।[9] पितृनियोगात्क्षि[10]तित्याग इवापवादा[11]त्सीतात्यागे[12] च सदृशान्तरप्रसक्त्यभावेन तद्व्यवच्छेदस्य फलत्वायोगाच्च । एवम्--

'उपाददे तस्य सहस्ररश्मिस्त्वष्ट्रा[13] नवं निर्मितमातपत्रम् ।
स तद्दुकूलादविदूरमौलिर्बभौ पतद्गङ्ग इवोत्तमाङ्गे ।।'

इत्यादावप्येकस्यैवोपमानोपमेयभाव: स्पष्ट: । न चैतेषु क्वचिद्धर्मादिषु वृत्तेरवरजेषु वृत्तेश्चोपमानोपमेयभाव: । अन्यत्र क्षितित्यागस्य सीतात्यागस्य चापरत्र गंगापतनस्य दुकूलसंनिधानस्य च । न तु क्वचिदप्येकस्यैव धर्मिण उपमानोपमेयभाव: । विशिष्टान्वयिनो[14]ऽपि विशेष्यबाधे[15] विशेषणसंक्रमौचित्यादिति वाच्यम् । यथा धर्मार्थकामेषु समवृत्तिं[16] प्रपेदे तथावरजेष्वित्यादिप्रकारे[17]णैकस्यैवोपमानोपमेयभावे निबद्धेऽपि तस्य विशेषणसंक्रान्ति[18]कल्पने 'पाण्ड्योऽयमंसार्पितलम्बहार:' इत्यादीनामपि[19] हारनिर्झरादीनामेवोपमानोपमेयभाव: स्यादिति बिम्बप्रतिबिम्बोदाहरणमात्रविलोपप्रसंगात् । 'रामरावणयोर्युद्धम्' इत्यादावभेदेऽप्युपमानोपमेयभावमभ्युपगच्छतामालंकारिकाणां विशेष्यबाधस्यापरिहरणीयत्वाच्च । तस्मादत्र सविशेषणे हि' इति न्यायोपन्यासो वाक्यमीमांसकानां शोभते नालं-

---

१- सागर: सागरोपम: इति क-ख-गपुस्तकेषु नास्ति २-ताति-ख, भाति-ग ३- नितान्तकान्ति-ख ४- लावद्विला-ख ५---युवलासवासा-क,ख ६- --मेवं-ख ७- समं-ख ८- इत्यत्रास्त्येव-ख ९- अथ पितृनियोगात् क्षितित्याग इवापवादात् सीतात्यागे न प्रतिषेद्धव्योऽहमित्येतावित्येव तात्पर्येण सदृशान्तरव्यवच्छेदे तात्पर्यात् इत्यधिक क-पुस्तके, ख-पुस्तके तु पितृनियोगात् क्षितित्याग इवापवादात् सीतात्यागे न प्रतिषेध इत्याहमित्थं-- तात्पर्यात् इत्यधिकम् १०-राज्यत्यागे-क,ख ११-इव इति क-खयो: नास्ति १२- अपवादभयात्-क,ख १३-त्वष्ट्रा इत्यारभ्य उत्तमाङ्गे इत्यन्तं क-खयो: नास्ति १४-विशिष्टान्वयिनोपमेयभावे निबद्धेऽपि तस्य विशेषण--ख १५- विशिष्यबाधे-क १६-समावृत्तिं-क १७- अपि इत्यधिकं खपुस्तके १८-विशेषणोपसंक्रान्ति-क १९-इत्यादावपि-क,ख,ग

कारमीमांसकानाम् । वाक्यमीमांसका ह्यभेदे उपमानोपमेयभावनिर्देश एव नास्तीति मन्यमाना 'रामरावणयोर्युद्धं' इत्यादावद्यतनस्य पूर्वेद्युस्तनं युद्ध-मुपमानम् । एतत्कल्पगगनस्य कल्पान्तरगगनमुपमानमित्यादि कल्पयन्ति । तस्मादालंकारिकमते एतेष्वेकस्यैवोपमानोपमेयभाव इति लक्षणमतिव्याप्त-मिति चेत् ।

अत्र ब्रूमः--

'स्वस्य स्वेनोपमा या स्यादनुगाम्येकधर्मिका[1] ।

अन्वर्थनामधेयोऽयमनन्वय इतीरितः ।।'

स्वस्य स्वेनेति विशेषणादुपमेयोपमायां रसनोपमायां[2] च नातिव्याप्तिः । अनुगाम्येकधर्मिकेति[3] विशेषणादुदाहृतोपमाविशेषेषु[4] नातिव्याप्तिः यद्यपि तेष्वपि समां[5] वृत्तिं प्रपेदे इत्याद्यशेऽनुगामिधर्मप्रवेशः[6] तथाप्येको न भवति । धर्मार्थकामावरजादि[7]बिम्बप्रतिबिम्बभावकरम्बितत्वात् । अत एवैकग्रहणमप्यर्थवत् । अन्वर्थनामधेय इति तु[8] न लक्षणान्तर्गतम् । किं तु स्वेन स्वस्योपमाप्यनुगाम्येकधर्मा चेदेवानन्वयो नान्यथेत्यत्रोपपत्तिमात्रपरम् । धर्म्यैक्ये हि स्वस्य स्वेनोपमा नान्वेतीत्यनन्वय इत्यन्वर्थं नाम भवति । अनन्वयपर्यनिबन्धनवशाच्चानुपमत्वद्योतनफलपर्यन्तं धावेत्[9] । धर्मभेदे तु एकधर्मावच्छिन्नेन स्वेनैव धर्मान्तरावच्छिन्नस्य[10] स्वस्योपमान्वेतीति न तत्रान्वर्थं नाम, न वानन्वयपर्यनिबन्धनाधीनानुपमत्वफललाभः । इदमनन्वयत्वप्रयोजकं लक्षणम् । लक्षणमात्रं तु 'यत्र तेनैव तस्य स्यात्[11]' इति भामहोक्तमनुसंधेयम् । 'उभौ यदि व्योम्नि पृथक्प्रवाहौ' इत्यतिशयोक्तिविशेषेऽनुपमत्वद्योतनफलसाम्यकल्पनावत्यतिव्याप्तिनिरासाय तेनैव तस्येति विशेषणम् ।

अयमनन्वयो व्यंग्योऽप्यस्ति । यथा--

'अद्य या मम गोविन्द जाता त्वयि गृहागते ।

कालेनैषा भवेत्प्रीतिस्तवैवागमनात्पुनः ।।'

अत्र गृहागतं श्रीकृष्णं प्रति विदुरवाक्ये इयं त्वदागमनप्रभवा प्रीतिर्बहुकालव्यवहितेन पुनरपि त्वदागमनेनैव भवेत् नान्येनेत्युक्तिभंग्या त्व-

---

१- एकधर्मतः क,ख २- रशनोपमायां--ख ३- अनुगाम्येकधर्मेत इति--क
४- पमाविशेषु--क ५- सम--ख ६- प्रवेशः इति क-खयोः पुस्तकेषु नास्ति
७- धर्मार्थकाम--ख ८- तु इति कपुस्तके नास्ति ९- तात्पर्ययम् इत्यधिकं क-गयोः
१०- धर्मान्तरावच्छिन्नस्य इत्यतः तेनैव (२१ प०) इत्यन्तं खपुस्तके नास्ति
११-समग्रा कारिका -यत्र तेनैव तस्य स्यादुपमानोपमेयता । असादृश्यविवक्षातो वदन्ति तमनन्वयम् ।। इति कपुस्तके दृश्यते।

दागमनप्रभवप्रीते: सैव सदृशी न त्वितरप्रभवेति व्यज्यते । एतादृशव्या-
वृत्त्यर्थमनन्वयालंकारलक्षणेऽव्यंग्यत्वविशेषणं पूर्ववद्द्रष्टव्यम् ।।

इत्यनन्वयप्रकरणम् । [1]

अथ स्मरणालंकार:-

स्मृति: सादृश्यमूला या वस्त्वन्तरसमाश्रया ।
स्मरणालंकृति: सा स्यादव्यंग्यत्वविशेषिता । [2]

यथा--

'अपि तुरगसमीपादुत्पतन्तं मयूरं
न स रुचिरकलापं बाणलक्षीचकार ।
सपदि गतमनस्कश्चित्रमाल्यानुकीर्णे
रतिविगलितबन्धे केशपाशे प्रियाया: ।।'

यथा वा--

'दिव्यानामपि कृतविस्मयां पुरस्ता-
दम्भस्त: स्फुरदरविन्दचारुहस्ताम् ।
उद्वीक्ष्य [3] श्रियमिव कांचिदुत्तरन्ती-
मस्मार्षीज्जलनिधिमन्थनस्य शौरि: ।।'

एकत्र सदृशदर्शनात्तत्सदृशधर्मिका [4] स्मृति: । इतरत्र सदृशदर्शनात्त-
त्सदृशलक्ष्मीसंबंन्धिनो जलनिधिमन्थनस्य स्मृति: । उभयत्रापि सादृश्यमू-
लकवस्त्वन्तरस्मृतित्वमविशिष्टम् । अत एव [5] सदृशासदृशसाधारण्यार्थतया
लक्षणे वस्त्वन्तरग्रहणमर्थवत् ।

'सौमित्रे ननु सेव्यतां तरुतलं चण्डांशुरुज्जृम्भते
चण्डांशोर्निशि का कथा रघुपते चन्द्रोऽयमुन्मीलति ।
वत्सैतद्विदितं कथं नु भवता धत्ते कुरंगं यत:
क्वासि प्रेयसि हा कुरंगनयने चन्द्रानने जानकि ।।'

अत्र श्रुतकुरंगसंबन्धिनस्तन्नयनस्य स्मरणात्तत्सदृशसीतानयनस्मृति-
स्तत्संबन्धिसीतास्मृतिश्चेति । किं त्वेषा [6] व्यंग्या, अलंकार्यभूता च । तद्व्या-
वृत्त्यर्थमव्यंग्यत्वविशेषणम् [7] ।

---

१- चित्रमीमांसायाम् इत्यधिकं गपुस्तके २- स्यातव्यंग्य--ख- ३- आलोक्य-क
४- ततसदृशधर्मिका-ख, ५- अतएव इति क-खपुस्तकयो: नास्ति ६- क्वेषा (?)
ख -७- व्यावृत्त्यर्थव्यंग्यत्व--ख

'अत्युच्चा: परित: स्फुरन्ति गिरय: स्फारास्तथाम्भोधय-
स्तानेतानपि बिभ्रती[१] किमपि न क्लान्तासि[२] तुभ्यं नम: ।।
आश्चर्येण मुहुर्मुहु: स्तुतिमिति प्रस्तौमि यावद्भुव-
स्तावद्बिभ्रदिमां स्मृतस्तव[३] भुजो वाचस्ततो मुद्रिता: ।।'

[४]स्तूयमानभूसंबन्धिनो भूभृद्भुजस्य[५] स्मृतिर्न सादृश्यमूलेति[६] नात्र स्मरणालंकार: । किं तु स्मृते: संचारिभावस्य भूभृद्विषयरतिभावांगत्वात्प्रेयोलंकार: ।

'स तथेति प्रतिज्ञाय विसृज्य कथमप्युमाम् ।
ऋषीञ्ज्योतिर्मयान्सप्त सस्मार स्मरशासन: ।।'

अत्र चिन्तामूला स्मृति: विच्छित्तिविशेषाभावान्न कश्चिदलंकार: । एतदुभयव्यावृत्त्यर्थं सादृश्यमूलेति विशेषणम् । स्वमेते भेदाभेदसाधारणसाधर्म्यमूला अलंकारा:[७] प्रदर्शिता: ।।

इति[८] स्मरणालंकारप्रकरणम् ।

---

अथाभेदप्रधानेषु प्रथमं रूपकं निरूप्यते-

आरोपविषयस्य स्यादतिरोहितरूपिण: ।
[९]उपरञ्जकमारोप्यमाणं तद्रूपकं मतम् ।।

अत्रारोपविषयस्येत्यनेनोत्प्रेक्षातिशयोक्त्योर्व्यावृत्ति: । तत्र मुखादेरारोपविषयत्वाभावात् । अतिरोहितरूपिण इत्यनेन ससंदेहभ्रान्तिमदपह्नुतीनां व्यावृत्ति: । तेषु संदेहभ्रान्त्यपह्नवैर्विषयस्य तिरोधानात् । उपरञ्जकमित्यनेन समासोक्तिपरिणामव्यावृत्ति: । तयोर्हि नोपरञ्जकत्वं विषयेष्वताद्रूप्यापादकत्वलक्षणम् । समासोक्तौ व्यवहारमात्रसमारोपेण ताद्रूप्यप्रतीतेरेवाभावात् । परिणामे आरोप्यमाणस्यैव विषयताद्रूप्यापत्त्या विषयस्यारोप्यमाणताद्रूप्यापत्त्यभावादित्याहु: ।।

अत्रेदं विचार्यते । आरोपाध्यवसाययो: कीदृशं भेदमभिसंधा(य)रोपविषयस्येत्यनेनोत्प्रेक्षाव्यावृत्तिरुच्यते । यदि विषयविषयिणोरभिहितयोरभेदप्रतिपत्तिरारोप: : विषयनिगरणेन विषयिणस्तदभेदप्रतिपत्तिरध्यवसाय

---

१- बिभ्रता-ख २- भ्रान्ता-ख,ग ३- स्मृतव-ख ४- अत्र इत्यधिकं कपुस्तके ५- भूभृत्पदस्य -ख ६- मूलेतिनात्रेति -क ७- अलंकार: ख ८- चित्रमीमांसायाम् इत्यधिकं गपुस्तके ९- उपरञ्जकमित्यारभ्य अतिरोहितरूपिण इत्यन्तं ख-पुस्तके नास्ति

इति भेदमभिसंधाय, तदोत्प्रेक्षारोपमूलैव स्यात् । तत्र "नूनं मुखं चन्द्रः" इति विषयस्य मुखास्याप्यभिधानेन तन्निगरणाभावात् । ततश्च तत्रातिव्याप्ति[1]रनिवारितैव स्यात् । तादूप्यप्रतिपत्ति[2]रारोपस्तदभेदप्रतिपत्तिरध्यवसाय इति तयोर्भेदः । मुखं चन्द्रः" इत्यादिरूपके चन्द्रस्य यद्रूपं चन्द्रत्वं तेन रूपवत्तामात्रं मुखस्य प्रतीयते । न तु प्रसिद्धचन्द्राभेदः । "मुखविषयायां "चन्द्रः" इत्याद्यतिशयोक्तौ तु तदभेद एव प्रतीयत इति चेत्, न । वैपरीत्यस्यापि वक्तुं शक्यत्वात् । न च वाच्यम् ।

"इन्दोरपि मृगाङ्कदृशीणां मुखेन्दुरतिरिच्यते ।
निर्जरैः पीयमानोऽपि यः कदाचिन्न हीयते ।।"

इति मुखचन्द्रस्य प्रसिद्धचन्द्राद्यतिरेकवर्णनं तदभेदप्रतिपत्तौ न संभवतीति रूपके तादूप्यप्रतिपत्तिरेवेति । तथा सति हि

"सुधाबद्धग्रासैरुपवनचकोरै[3]रनुसृतां
किरञ्ज्योत्स्नामच्छां लवलिफल[4]पाकप्रणयिनीम् ।
उपप्राकाराग्रं प्रहिणु नयने तर्कय मना-
गनाकाशे कोऽयं गलितहरिणः शीतकिरणः ।।"

"अपरः पाकशासनः" इत्याद्यतिशयोक्तौ "अपर इव पाकशासनः" इत्याद्युत्प्रेक्षायां च रूपकवदेव[5] प्रसिद्धचन्द्राद्यभेदप्रतिपत्त्य[6]भावेन तादूप्यप्रतिपत्तिरेव स्यादिति तयोर्लक्षणस्यातिव्याप्तिरनेना[7]निवारिता स्यात् । अथ तत्र प्रसिद्धचन्द्राद्यभेदप्रतिपत्त्यभावेऽप्युपाचकल्पितापरचन्द्राद्यभेदप्रतिपत्तिः संभवतीति चेत् । रूपकेऽप्येवं वक्तुं शक्यमित्यसंभव एव लक्षणस्य स्यात् । किं चातिरोहितरूपिण इत्यनेन ससंदेहभ्रान्तिमतोरतिव्याप्तिवारणेऽपि नापह्नवेऽतिव्याप्तिवारणम्[8] । नेदं मुखं किं तु चन्द्रः" इत्यत्र मुखे मुखत्वाभावारोपस्य चन्द्रत्वोपस्य[9] चाहार्यत्वेन विषयतिरोधायकत्वाभावात् । आहार्यारोपस्यापि तिरोधायकत्वे रूपकेऽपि लक्षणस्यासंभवः स्यात् । उत्प्रेक्षाया अप्याहार्य[10]संभावनारूपाया अतिरोहितरूपिण[11] इत्यनेनैव व्यावृत्तिसिद्धावारोपविषयस्येति विशेषणस्य वैयर्थ्यं च स्यात् । अतिशयोक्तौ विषयस्य निगीर्णस्य तिरोहितत्वेन तस्या अप्यनेनैव व्यावृत्तिः[12] । अपि च ;

---

१- तत्राप्याप्तिः ख- २- अथ तादूप्य--क,ख ३- चकोरैरनुसृतः -ख
४- नवलवलिफल--क, नवलवलिफलकिपूणयिनी-ख ५- रूपकपदेव-ख
६- प्रतिपत्त्यसंभवेन-क,ख ७- व्याप्तिरनन-ख ८- अतिव्याप्तिवारन्नेदं मुखं-- ख
९- चन्द्रत्वारोपस्य इति ख-पुस्तके छिराकृतम १०- आहार्या-क ११- रूपित-ख
१२- व्यावृत्तिसिद्धेः -क,ख,ग

'त्वत्पादनखरत्नानां यदलक्तकमार्जनम् ।
इदं श्रीखण्डलेपेन पाण्डुरीकरणं विधोः ।।'

इति निदर्शनायामतिव्याप्तिः । तत्रोपमेयवाक्यार्थे उपमानवाक्यार्थता-रूप्यारोपसद्भावात् । यदि चारोपविषयस्य पदार्थस्येति विशेषणम्[1] तथा-प्यलक्तककृतत्वत्पादनखमार्जनं श्रीखण्डलेपकृतविधुपाण्डुरीकरणमिति नि-दर्शनायामतिव्याप्तिः ।

'अंघ्रिदण्डो हरेरूर्ध्वमुत्क्षिप्तो बलिनिग्रहे ।
विधिविष्टरपद्मस्य नालदण्डो मुदेऽस्तु वः[2] ।।'

इति रूपकेऽव्याप्तिश्च । यत्तु सरस्वतीकण्ठाभरणोक्तं लक्षणम् ---

'यदोपमानशब्दानां गौणवृत्तिव्यपाश्रयात् ।
उपमेये भवद्वृत्तिस्तदा तद्रूपकं विदुः ।।' इति ।

तदप्यतिशयोक्तावतिव्याप्तम् । 'मुखं चन्द्रः' इति रूपके चन्द्रशब्दस्य मुखे गौणसारोपलक्षणा । चन्द्र इत्यतिशयोक्तौ साध्यवसानलक्षणेत्यालं-कारिकसिद्धान्तात् । वस्तुतस्त्वतिशयोक्तावेव लक्षणा न तु रूपके इति शक्यं व्यवस्थापयितुम् । तथाहि । अतिशयोक्तौ विषयाभिधायिमुखादि-पदाप्रयोगाच्चन्द्रादिपदेनैव तत्प्रत्यायनं कार्यमिति तस्य तत्र लक्षणावश्य-मास्थेया । रूपके विषयविषयिणोः स्वस्ववाचकाभिहितयोरभेदप्रतिपत्तिः संसर्गमर्यादयैव संभवतीति किमर्थं तत्र लक्षणा, अशक्या च तत्र लक्ष-णाभ्युपगन्तुम् । कथम् । 'मुखं चन्द्र' इत्यत्र लक्षणया मुखे प्रवर्तमानं चन्द्रत्वं[3] केन निमित्तेन प्रवर्तेत । मुखत्वेन वा, मुखासाधारणकान्तिविशेषेण[4] वा, च-न्द्रत्वेन वा, चन्द्रासाधारणकान्तिविशेषेण वा, मुखचन्द्रोभयानुगतकान्तिसा-मान्येन वा, मुखगतचन्द्रसादृश्येन वा । नाद्यः । मुखपदेन[5] पौनरुक्त्यापत्तेः । मुखत्वस्य शक्यासंबन्धित्वेन तेन निमित्तेन लक्षणायोगाच्च । अत एव न द्वितीयः[6] । न तृतीयचतुर्थौ[7] । मुखावृत्तिधर्मयोस्तत्र प्रवृत्तिनिमित्तत्वायो-गात् । न पंचमः । कान्तिमान्मुखचन्द्र इत्यत्र कान्तिमत्पदेन पौनरुक्त्या-पत्तेः । नापि षष्ठः । सादृश्यस्य शब्दप्रतिपाद्यत्वेनाव्यंग्यत्वेन रूपकस्यो-

---

१- विशेषणीयम्- क,ख,ग २- नः -ख ३- चन्द्रपदं-क ४- मुखसाधारण-ग
५- मुखपदे -क, मुखपदेन पौनरुक्त्यापत्तेः इति द्विरावृत्तम् ख पुस्तके ६- द्वितीयम्-ख
७- अपि इत्यधिकं क-पुस्तके

पमापृथग्भावादनुपपत्ते: । अभेदप्रधानं रूपकमिति सिद्धान्तविरोधाच्च[1] त-
स्माद्रूपके स्वस्वपदाभिहितयोर्विषयविषयिणोरभेद[2]प्रतिपत्ति: संसर्गमर्यादयेत्येव
वक्तव्यमिति लक्षणस्यासंभवोऽपि दोष:। यदा तु "वक्त्रेन्दौ तव सत्ययं य-
दपर: शीतांशुरुज्जृम्भते", "द्वौ चन्द्रौ जगतो राजन्स दिवि त्वं महीतले"
इत्यादौ विषयस्य प्रसिद्धचन्द्राभेदप्रतिपत्तिर्न संभवतीति कथंचिदिन्द्वादि-
पदस्य विषये लक्षणा कल्प्यते । तथापि "कान्तिमान्मुखचन्द्र" इत्यादौ का-
ठकाध्यापकादिवत्संसर्गमर्यादयैवाभेदप्रतिपत्तिसंभवेनातिक्लिष्टलक्षणाश्रयणा-
योगात्तत्राव्याप्तिर्वज्रलेपायते । अपि च ।

"सेतु: शैलैस्त्वया[3] बद्ध: पूर्वं जेतुं दशाननम् ।
कं जेतुमथ[4] बध्नासि यशश्चन्द्रोपलै: प्रभो ।।"

"चिरादस्त्कौतुकाविष्टं कल्पवृक्षमुदीक्षितुम् ।
तन्मे सफलमद्यासीन्नेत्रं त्वय्यवलोकिते[5] ।।"

इत्यादौ व्यंग्यरूपके चाव्याप्ति: । अत्र ह्याद्ये वर्ण्यं प्रभुं प्रति रावण-
वधाय त्वया सेतुर्बद्ध इति निर्दिश्यमानेन[6] वस्तुना त्वमेव राम इति रूपकं
व्यज्यते । न च तत्र विषये गौणं रामपदमस्ति । द्वितीये त्वामवलोकयता
मम नेत्रेण चिरकाङ्क्षितं कल्पवृक्षावलोकनं लब्धमिति प्रतीयमानेन विशे-
षालंकारेण त्वमेव कल्पवृक्ष इति रूपकं व्यज्यते । तत्र कल्पवृक्षपदं प्रसि-
द्धकल्पवृक्षपरमेव न विषयलक्षकमिति स्पष्टम् ।

"तत: कुमुदनाथेन कामिनीगण्डपाण्डुना ।
नेत्रानन्देन चन्द्रेण माहेन्द्री दिगलंकृता ।।"

इति शुद्धसारोपलक्षणामूलकरूपके चाव्याप्ति: । तत्र ह्यानन्दहेतुत्वा-
दानदानन्दत्वरूपणं न त्वौपम्यात् । यत्तु "आयुर्घृत"मित्यादौ विच्छित्तिविशेषाद[7]-
र्शनाच्छुद्धसारोपलक्षणास्थले न कश्चिदलंकार इति । तदयुक्तम् । "गौर्वा-
हीक" इत्यादौ विच्छित्तिविशेषादर्शनेन गौणसारोपलक्षणास्थलेऽप्यलंकार-
त्वाभावप्रसंगात्[8] । क्वचिद्वैचित्र्यादर्शनेऽप्यन्यत्र वैचित्र्यवति स्थलेऽलंकार-
त्वमिष्टापि वक्तुं युक्तम् । "नेत्रानन्देन चन्द्रेण"[9] इति ।

---

१- च इति कपुस्तके नास्ति २- णो रामव-ख-३- शैलस्त्वया-क ४- जेतुमध्य-ख
५- अवलोकिते: (?) - ख-६- निर्दिश्यमान इति वस्तुना-ख, ७- विशेष(?)
क-८- अलंकारभाव--क,ख ९- इति इति क-ख-ग पुस्तकेषु नास्ति

"आयुर्दानमहोत्सवस्य, विनतत्राणीभूता मूर्तिमान्
विश्वासो, नयनोत्सवो मृगदृशां, कीर्ते:[१] प्रकाश: पर: ।
आनन्द: कलिताकृति: सुमनसां, वीरश्रियो जीवितं
धर्मस्यैष[२] निकेतनं, विजययते[३] वीर: कलिङ्गेश्वर: ।।

इत्यादौ शुद्धसारोपलक्षणास्थलेऽपि वैचित्र्यदर्शनात् । यदि तु हेतुमता सह हेतोरभिधानमभेदतो[४] हेतुरिति मतान्तराश्रयेण तत्र हेत्वलंकारो न रूपकमित्यभ्युपगम्येत ; तदा "आरोपविषयस्य स्यात्" इति पूर्वोदाहृतलक्षणस्य तत्रातिव्याप्ति:[५] । एवम्--"उपमैव[६] तिरोभूतभेदा रूपकमुच्यते[७] । रूपकं तद[८]भेदो य उपमानोपमेययो:" इत्यादिलक्षणेष्वप्यतिव्याप्त्यादिदोषा यथासंभवमुन्नेया: । अत्र वदाम: --

"बिम्बाविशिष्टे निर्दिष्टे विषये यद्यनिह्नुते ।
उपरञ्जकतामेति विषयी रूपकं तदा ।।"

बिम्बाविशिष्ट इति विशेषणात् "त्वत्पादनखरत्नानाम्" इति निदर्शनायां नातिव्याप्ति: । तत्र हि चन्द्रो यथा स्वत: शुभ्रत्वादनासंजनीयधावल्यस्तथा नखा: स्वतोऽरुणत्वादनासंजनीयारुण्या इति सादृश्येन नखानां चन्द्रस्य च बिम्बप्रतिबिम्बभाव: । अलक्तकचन्दनयोरन्यत्र स्ववर्णासंजकत्वेन । ततश्च तत्र बिम्बभावा[९]न्नखालक्तकविशिष्टे एव[१०] रञ्जने तत्प्रतिबिम्बभूतचन्द्रचन्दनविशिष्टपाण्डरीकरणमुपरञ्जकम् । एवमन्यत्रापि "अरण्यरुदितं कृतम्" इत्यादितादृप्यारोपवन्निदर्शनोदाहरणे सर्वत्र बिम्बभावापन्नवस्तुविशिष्ट एवोपमेये तत्प्रतिबिम्बविशिष्टमुपमानमुपरञ्जकमिति न क्वाप्यतिव्याप्ति: । रूपके तु न क्वचिदपि बिम्बप्रतिबिम्बभावापन्नधर्मविशिष्टतया विषयविषयिणोरुपादानम् । सावयवरूपकेऽपि विशेष्यरूप[११]णात्पृथगेवावयवेषु रूपणं न त्ववयवविशिष्टरूपेण विशेष्ये । "अङ्घ्रिदण्डो हरेरूर्ध्वम्" इत्यत्राप्यङ्घ्रिदण्डनालदण्डयोर्न बिम्बप्रतिबिम्बविशिष्टता । तयो: प्रतीयमानेन[१२] श्यामलत्वविधातृविष्टरकमलश्लिष्टत्वाद्यनुगामिधर्मेणैवोपमानोपमेयभावात् । किं तु विधातृविष्टरकमलश्लिष्टत्वरूपसाधारणधर्मवक्तासंपादनार्थं विशेषणविशिष्टतामात्रमुपमेयस्य ।

---

१-कीर्ति: क- २- धर्मस्यैकतिकेतनं-क ३- विजयते" इति खपुस्तके नास्ति ४- हेतोरभिधानं भेदतो--ख ५- तत्राव्याप्ति: -घ- ६- उपमैवं-ख ७- रूपकमिष्यते-रूपकमिष्यते: (?) ख-८- तद्रूपकमभेदो-घ- ९- बिम्बभावापन्ननखा--क,ग १०- एव इत्यारभ्य वस्तुविशिष्ट (२०प०) इत्यन्तं खपुस्तके नास्ति ११- विशिष्य-क १२- प्रतीयमनत्वविधातृ---ख

निर्दिष्ट इति विशेषणान्न निगीर्णविषयायामतिशयोक्त्यामतिव्याप्तिः[१]। व्यंग्यरूपकोदाहरणेषु विषयिवाचकाप्रयोगसंभवेऽपि विषयनिर्देशः सार्वत्रिक इति न तत्राव्याप्तिः। "नेत्रानन्देन" इत्यादौ हेत्वलंकार इति मते विषय इत्यनेनोपमेय इत्येतदर्थकेन तदा(व्या)वृत्तिः। तत्रापि रूपकमित्येकावलीकारादिमते विषयपदं धर्मिमात्रपरं[२] स्पष्टार्थम्[३]।

अनिह्नुते निषेधास्पृष्ट इति विशेषणादपह्नुतौ नातिव्याप्तिः।

उपरञ्जकतामाहार्यताद्रूप्यनिश्चयगोचरतामेतीत्यनेन ससंदेहोत्प्रेक्षासमासोक्तिपरिणामभ्रान्तिमत्स्वतिव्याप्तिनिरासः। ससंदेहोत्प्रेक्षयोर्निश्चयस्यैवाभावात्। समासोक्तौ परिणामे च तस्य ताद्रूप्यागोचरत्वात्। समासोक्तौ व्यवहारमात्रसमारोपात्। परिणामे आरोप्यमाणस्यैव विषयताद्रूप्यगोचरत्वात्। भ्रान्तिमति स्वतः कल्पितस्य वा प्रवृत्त्यादिपर्यन्तस्य स्वारसिकस्यैव[४] निबन्धने तस्यानाहार्यत्वात्।

अव्यंग्यविशेषणाच्चैतदेवालंकारभूतस्य[५] रूपकस्य लक्षणमिति सर्वं सुस्थम्। तच्च रूपकं त्रिविधम्- निरवयवं सावयवं परम्परितं च। निरवयवं केवलं माला चेति द्विविधम्। सावयवं तु[६] समस्तवस्तुविषयमेकदेशविवर्ति चेति द्विविधम्। परम्परितं च[७] श्लिष्टाश्लिष्टशब्दनिबन्धनत्वेन द्विविधं सत्केवलं माला चेति द्वैविध्याच्चतुर्विधम्। एवमष्टविधो[८] रूपकालंकारः[९]।तत्र केवलं निरवयवं यथा--

"कुरंगीवांगानि स्तिमितयति गीतध्वनिषु य-
त्सखीं कान्तोदन्तं श्रुतमपि पुनः प्रश्नयति यत्।
अनिद्रं यच्चान्तः[१०] स्वपिति तदहो[११] वेद्म्यभिनवां
प्रवृत्तोऽस्याः[१२] सेक्तुं हृदि मनसिजः प्रेमलतिकाम्।।"

मालानिरवयवं यथा--

"सौन्दर्यस्य तरंगिणी तरुणिमोत्कर्षस्य हर्षोद्गमः
कान्तेः कार्मणकर्म नर्मवचसामुल्लासनावासभूः[१३]।

---

१- अतिशयोक्तावतिव्याप्तिः क,ख,ग २- धर्मिभावपरः ख-३- स्पष्टार्थः -ख ४- स्वारसिकभ्रमस्यैव-क ५- --षणाच्चैवदमेवालं--क-६- तु इति क-ख-ग पुस्तकेषु नास्ति ७- च इति कपुस्तके नास्ति ८- अष्टविध-क ९- रूपकलम-क १०- यश्चान्तः क ११- तदेहोत्यभिनवं-ख १२- प्रवृत्तोस्याः-ख १३- नर्मरहसां-क,ख

विधा वक्रगिरां विधेरन[1]वधिप्रावीण्यसाक्षात्क्रिया
[2]प्राणाः पञ्चशिलीमुखस्य ललनाचूडामणिः सा प्रिया ।।

समस्तवस्तुविषयं सावयवं यथा--

ज्योत्स्नाभस्मच्छुरणधवला बिभ्रती तारकास्थी-
न[3]न्तर्धानव्यसनरसिका रात्रिकापालिकीयम् ।
द्वीपाद्द्वीपं भ्रमति दधती चन्द्रमुद्राकपाले
न्यस्तं सिद्धाञ्जनपरिमलं लाञ्छनस्य च्छलेन ।।

एकदेशविवर्ति सा[4]वयवं यथा--

प्रौढमौक्तिकरुचः पयोमुचां बिन्दवः कुटजपुष्पबन्धवः ।
विद्युतां नमसि नाट्यमण्डपे कुर्वते स्म कुसुमाञ्जलिश्रियम् ।।

अत्र नभसो नाट्यमण्डपत्वेन रू[5]पणाद्विद्युतामर्थान्नर्तकीत्वं गम्यते । इ-
त्येकदेशे रूपकस्य वि[6]शेषणवाच्यतया वर्तनादिदमेकदेशविवर्ति ।

श्लिष्टशब्दनिबन्धनं केवलपरम्परितं यथा--

अलौकिकमहालोकप्रकाशितजगत्त्रयः ।
स्तूयते देव सद्वंशमुक्तारत्नं न कैर्भवान् ।।

अत्र त्वमेव मुक्तारत्नमित्यारोपणपूर्व[7]कः सद्वंश उत्तमान्वय एव सद्वंश
उत्कृष्टवेणुरित्यारोप इति रूपकद्वयमपि संभूतपरम्परमिति परम्परितम् ।
व[8]शे श्लिष्टशब्दनिबन्धनं च । तदेव मालापरम्परितं यथा--

विद्वन्मानसहंस वैरिकमलासंकोचदीप्तद्युते
दुर्गामार्गणनीललोहित समित्स्वीकारवैश्वान[9]र ।
सत्यप्रतिनि[10]धानदक्ष विजयप्राग्भाव भीम प्रभो
साम्राज्यं वरवीर वत्सरशतं वैरिञ्च[11]मुच्चैः क्रियाः ।।

अश्लिष्टशब्दनिबन्धनं केवल[12] परम्परितं यथा--

निरवधि च निराश्रयं च यस्य स्थितमनिवर्तितकौतुकप्रपंचम् ।
प्रथममिह[13] भवान्स कूर्म[14]नाथो जयति चतुर्दशलोकवल्लिकन्दः ।।

---

१- रणाविविप्रा- ख २- बाणाः-ग ३- न्यंतर्द्धीन-क ४- सादृश्यं-ख
५- रूढ रूपेण-ख ६- विशेषणं-ख ७- पूर्वक-क ८- वशेति-क,ख,ग ९-
वैश्वानरः-ख १०- --विधान -ख ११- वैरचमुच्चैः-क १२- केवलपरम्परितं-क १३-
प्रथमइह -क १४- कूर्ममूर्तिः-क

तदेव मालापरम्परितं यथा--

"पर्यङ्को राजलक्ष्म्या हरितमणिमय: पौरुषाब्धेस्तरंग:
संग्रामत्रासताम्यन्मुरलपतियशोहंसलीलाम्बुवाहः[1] ।
भग्नप्रत्यर्थिवंशोल्बणविजयकरिस्त्यानदानाम्बुपट्ट:
खङ्गःक्ष्मासौविदल्ल: समिति विजयते मालवाखण्डलस्य ।।"

इदं वैधर्म्येणापि दृश्यते । तत्केवलं यथा--

"आवृण्वतो लोचनमार्गमाजौ रजोऽन्धकारस्य विजृम्भितस्य ।
शस्त्रक्षताश्वद्विपवीरजन्मा बालारुणोऽभूद्रुधिरप्रवाह: ।।

मालारूपकं यथा--

"सौजन्याम्बुमरुस्थली सुजनतालेख्य[2]द्युमिच्छिर्णं-
ज्योत्स्नाकृष्णचतुर्दशी सरलतायोगश्वपुच्छच्छटा ।
यैरेषा[3]पि दुराशया कलियुगे राजावली सेविता
तेषां शूलिनि भक्तिमात्रसुलभे सेवा कियत्कौशलम् ।।"

एवमष्टौ भेदा रूपकालंकारस्य प्राचीनै: प्रदर्शिता: । एवं भेदा उपमाया अपि वक्तुं शक्या: । एकत्र प्रदर्शितेन प्रकारेण संभवस्थलेऽन्यत्राप्यूह्या इति न प्रदर्शिता: । तथाहि ;"वागर्थाविव संपृक्तौ" इत्यादौ केवलनिरवयवोपमा । "ज्योत्स्नेव नयनानन्द:" इत्यादौ मालानिरवयवोपमा ।

"तत: प्रतस्थे कौबेरीं भास्वानिव रघुर्दिशम् ।
शरैरुस्रैरिवोदीच्यानुद्धरिष्यन्[4]०००००० रसानिव ।।"

इत्यत्र समस्तवस्तुविषयसावयवोपमा ।

"नेत्रैरिवोत्पलै: पद्मैर्मुखैरिव सर:श्रिय: ।
पदे पदे विभान्ति स्म चक्रवाकै: स्तनैरिव ।।"

इत्यत्रैकदेशविवर्तिनी[5] ।

"अत्यन्तरागिणमपि निपीतवसुसंचयम्[6] ।
गणिकेवापरदिशा पूषाणं निरकासयत् ।।"

इत्यत्राप्येकदेशविवर्तिनी[7] । पूर्वत्र विशेषणोपमायां[8] विशेष्योपमा गम्यते, उत्तरत्र विशेष्योपमया[9] विशेषणोपमेति भेद: ।

---

१- --वाहा:-ख २- सुचरितालेख्य--क ३- यौरेषापि-ख ४- दुरिष्यत्-घ
५- विवर्तनी-ख ६- व्यपेतवसुसंचयम्-क,ख ७- विवर्तिनी:-क, विवर्तनी-ख
८- विशेष्योपमया-क, विशेषणोपमया-क, विशेषणोपमाया-ख
९- विशेष्योपमाया-क,ख

"दूरादयश्चक्रनिभस्य तन्वी तमालतालीवनराजिनीला ।
आभाति वेला लवणाम्बुराशेर्धारानिबद्धेव कलंकरेखा[1] ।।

इत्यत्राश्लिष्टशब्दनिबन्धनकेवलपरम्परितोपमा । अत्र ह्यम्बुराशेरयश्चक्रेणोपमा । तद्वाराश्लिष्टकलंकरेखया बेलाया उपमा चेति द्वयमपि संजातपरम्परम् । यथा वा--

"अस्त्रज्वालावलीढप्रतिबलजलधेरन्तरौर्वायमाणे
सेनानाथे स्थितेऽस्मिन्मम पितरि गुरौ सर्वधन्वीश्वराणाम् ।
कर्णालं संभ्रमेण व्रज[2] कृप समरं[3] मुञ्च[4] हार्दिक्य शंका[5]
ताते चापद्वितीये वहति रणधुरां[6] को भयस्यावकाश: ।।

अत्र द्रोणस्यौर्वेणोपमा प्रतिबलजलधेरित्यत्रोपमाया: साधिकेत्युपमाद्वयमपि[7] संजातपरम्परम् । एवं "राजहंसायते राजा विद्वणामेण मानसे" इत्यत्र श्लिष्टशब्दनिबन्धनकेवलपरम्परितोपमा । उभयत्रापि मालापरम्परितमनयैव रीत्योन्नेयम् । "रेणुध्वान्तस्य रक्तौघो बालघर्मकरायते" इति वैधर्म्येण रूपकवदुपमेति सर्वं समानम् ।

अयं तु विशेष: । समस्तवस्तु विषयं रूपकं न विशिष्टरूपकं भवति । विषयविषयिणोर्विम्बप्रतिबिम्बधर्मविशिष्टयोस्ताद्रूप्यारोपे निदर्शनाया एवावतरणात् । सावयवोपमा तु विशिष्टोपमां गमयति । "तत: प्रतस्थे कौबेरीं भास्वानिव" इत्यत्र शरदीच्यारुद्धतुत्तरां दिशं प्रस्थितस्य रघोर्विशिष्टस्य किरणै रसाञ्शोषयितुमुत्तरां दिशं प्रस्थितेन विशिष्टेन रविणा साधर्म्यस्य फलितार्थतया लाभात् । एवं च क्वचिदुपमयान्यत्रोपमाया[8] गम्यत्वं चतुर्धा पर्यवस्यति । क्वचिद्विशेषणोपमया विशेष्योपमाया: । विश्वजित्सर्वपृष्ठोऽतिरात्र: इत्यत्र पृष्ठगतसर्वताविधिनैव तद्विशेष्यपृष्ठविधे: । क्वचिद्विशेष्योपमया विशेषणोपमाया: । वैकृतप्रधानविधिनैव प्राकृततदंगकलापविधे: । उभयमप्येकदेशविवर्तित्वेनोदाहृतम् । क्वचिदवयवोपमया विशिष्टोपमाया गम्यत्वम् । अंगप्रधानगोचरप्रत्येक[9]विधिकलापेनेव सर्वांगविशिष्टप्रधागोचरप्रयोगविधे: । तत्तु समस्तवस्तुविषयोपमोदाहरणे

---

१- --लेखा-ख २- त्यज-ख ३- सदनं-ख ४- पाच-ख ५- शंका-ख
६- रणधुरं-ख ७- सावकेत्यु--ख ८- उपमया-ख ९- प्रत्येकं-क

दर्शितम् । एकवाक्यतायामवयवोपमया विशिष्टोपमाया गम्यत्वे इदमुदाहरणम् । वाक्यभेदेनापि दृश्यते--

'हस्त इव भूतिमलिनो यथा यथा लंघयति खलः[1] सुजनम् ।
दर्पणमिव तं कुरुते तथा तथा निर्मलच्छायम् ।।'

अत्रावयवोपमा[2] । यथा भूतिमलिनो हस्तो दर्पणमधिकमधिकं घर्षयन्नुत्तरोत्तरं निर्मलीकुरुते (?) तथा खलः सुजनमधिकं घर्षयन्नुत्तरोत्तरं निर्मलमेव कुरुते इति विशिष्टोपमा गम्यते । क्वचिद्विशिष्टोपमया[3] तदवयवोपमानां गम्यत्वम् । विशिष्टविधिनैव विशेषणविशेष्यविधीनाम् । यथा--

'त्वदाननमधीराक्षमाविर्दशनदीधिति[4] ।
भ्रम(द्भृंग)मिवालक्ष्यकेसरं भाति पंकजम् ।।'

अत्र विशिष्टेन विशिष्टस्योपमया तदवयवभूतानां भृंगलोचनानां केसरदशनदीधितीनां[5] पंकजाननयोश्चोपमानोपमेयभावो गम्यते । एवमसंख्या उपमाविकल्पाः । तथा--

'किसलयकरैर्लतानां करकमलैः कामिनां मनो[6] जयति ।
नलिनीनां[7] कमलमुखैर्मुखेन्दुभिर्योषितां मदनः[8] ।।'

इत्येवमाद्या रसनारूपकाद्या[9] रूपकविकल्पा अप्यसंख्याः । उक्तं हि काव्यालोके--

'अपर्यन्तो विकल्पानां रूपकोपमयोर्यतः ।
दिङ्मात्रं दर्शितं धीरैरनुक्तमनुमीयताम् ।।' इति ।

इति रूपकप्रकरणम्[10] ।

---

अथ परिणामः -

'आरोप्यमाणस्य[11] प्रकृतोपयोगित्वे परिणामः' इति तल्लक्षणमुक्तम् । तत्र शंक्यते ।

'यामि मनोवाक्कायैः शरणं[12] करुणात्मकं जगन्नाथ ।
जन्मजरामरणार्णवतरणतरण्यं[13] तवांघ्रियुगम् ।।'

---

१- खलः इति खपुस्तके नास्ति २- अत्रावयवोपमायां-ख ३-विशिष्टोपमा-ख ४-आविर्दर्शन--क ५- नखदीधितीनां-ख,ग,घ ६- जगज्जयति-क,ख ७- नलिनीनाम् इति छिरावृत्तम् खपुस्तके ८- मनः-ख ९- रशना-क,ग १०- चित्रमीमांसायाम् इत्यधिकं क-ख-गपुस्तकेषु ११- आरो--पि (?) ख १२- शरणं खपुस्तके नास्ति १३- तरणः इति खपुस्तके नास्ति

'निरीक्ष्य विद्युन्नयनैः पयोदो मुखं निशायामभिसारिकायाः ।
धारानिपातैः सह किं नु वान्तश्चन्द्रोऽयमित्यार्ततरं ररास ।।
'स्तान्यवन्तीश्वरपारिजातजाता[१]नि तारापतिपाण्डुराणि ।
संप्रत्यहं पश्यत दिग्वधूनां[२] यशःप्रसूनान्यवतंसयामि ।।'

इति श्लोकेष्वारोप्यमाणानां तरुण्य-नयन-प्रसूनानां तरुण-निरीक्षणा-वतंसनरूपप्रकृतकार्योपयोगे सत्यप्युक्तलक्षणकृतालंकारसर्वस्वकारेणैव रूपकमंगीकृतम् ।

'आत्मानं रथिनं विद्धि शरीरं रथमेव तु ।
बुद्धिं तु सारथिं विद्धि मनः प्रग्रहमेव च ।।'

इत्यादिश्रुतावारोप्यमाणानां रथिरथादीनां 'सोऽध्वनः पारमाप्नोति तद्विष्णोः परमं पदम्' इति वक्ष्यमाणाध्वपार[३]गमनरूपप्रकृतकार्योपयोगे सत्यपि भगवता बादरायणेन आनु[४]मानिकमप्येकेषामिति चेत् न शरीररूपकविन्यस्तगृहीतेर्दर्शयति[५] च' इति शारीरकसूत्रे रूपकमंगीकृतम् । अतस्तेषु लक्षणस्यातिव्याप्तिः । एवम्---

'भिन्नेषु रत्नकिरणैः किरणेष्विहेन्दो-[६]
रुच्चावचैरुपगतेषु सहस्रसंख्याम्[७] ।
दोषापि नूनमहिमांशुरसौ किलेति
व्याकोशकोकनदतां[८] दधते नलिन्यः ।।'

इति भ्रान्तिमति,

'विकसदमरनारीनेत्रनीलाब्जषण्डा-
न्यधिवसति सदा यः संयमाधःकृतानि ।
न तु रुचिरकलापे वर्तते यो मयूरे
वितरतु स कुमारो ब्रह्मचर्यश्रियं वः ।।'

इत्यपह्नुतौ,

उरोभुवा कुम्भयुगेन जृम्भितं नवोपहारेण वयःकृतेन किम् ।
त्रपासरिद्दुर्गमपि प्रतीर्य सा नलस्य तन्वी हृदयं विवेश यत् ।।'

---

१- जात इति लघुस्तके नास्ति २- पश्यति दिग्वधूनां-क, पश्यतरि (?) वधूनां-ख ३- परागमन-ख ४- बादरायेनानुमानिक-क, बादरायणेन नानुमानिक--ग,घ ५- गृहीतेदर्शति-ख ६- इवेन्दोः-ख ७- संख्या-ख ८- कोकनदता-ख

इत्यतिशयोक्तौ[१],

चक्रभ्रमणकरत्वात्त्वद्दृष्टिभिर्दूरवर्ज्यमानत्वात् ।
श्रुत्यन्तखेलनत्वान्मशक[२] त्वामेव माधवं मन्ये ।।

इत्यनुमाने चातिव्याप्तिः । भ्रान्तिमत्यब्जिभाशोर्विकासे, अपह्नुतावमरनारीनेत्राणां ब्रह्मचर्यवितरणे, अतिशयोक्तौ कुम्भयुगस्य सरित्तरणे, अनुमाने माधवस्य चक्रभ्रमणे[३] च प्रकृतकार्योपयोगित्वात् । अपह्नुतौ तं यथा यथोपासते तथैव भवति[४] इति तत्क्रतुन्यायेन संयमाधःकृतामरनारीनेत्राधिष्ठानस्य ब्रह्मचर्यवितरणोपयोगित्वम् ।

सुहृदालापेनैव प्रणश्यति स्थास्नुरान्तरः क्लेशः[५] ।
कान्तामुखचन्द्रेण हि शाम्यति रुचिरेण विरहजस्तापः ।।

इति दृष्टान्तसंकीर्णपरिणामे चाव्याप्तिः । अत्रा[६]रोप्यमाणस्योपमानकोटयन्तर्गताप्रकृतकार्योपयोगित्वादिति ।

अत्राहुः । आरोप्यमाणस्य प्रकृतात्मनोपयोगित्वे परिणाम इति लक्षणार्थः । न चैवं सत्युदाहृतरूपकादिष्वतिव्याप्तिः । तेष्वारोप्यमाणानां तरण्यनयनप्रसूनसूर्यादीनां स्वात्मनैव तरणनिरीक्षणावतंसनकमलविकासनादिकार्योपयोगित्वसंभवेन तदर्थमङ्घ्रियुगविधुयशश्चन्द्रादिप्रकृतात्मतापत्त्यनपेक्षणात् न चोक्तलक्षणस्य परिणामेऽसंभवः । यत्रारोप्यमाणं किंचित्कार्योपयोगित्वेन निबध्यमानं स्वतस्तस्य तदुपयोगित्वासंभवात्प्रकृतात्मतापत्तिमपेक्षते तत्रैव परिणामांगीकारात् । यथा प्रसन्नेन दृगब्जेन वीक्षते मदिरेक्षणा इति । अत्र त्वब्जस्य वीक्षणो[७]पयोगित्वं निबध्यते । मयूरव्यंसकादिसमासेनोत्तरपदार्थप्राधान्यात् । न चोपमितिसमासा[८]श्रयणेन पूर्वपदार्थप्राधान्याद्दृश[९] एव तदुपयोगित्वं निबध्यत इत्यस्त्विति वाच्यम् । प्रसन्नेनेति सामान्यधर्मप्रयोगात् । उपमितं व्याघ्रादिभिः सामान्याप्रयोगे इति तदप्रयोग एवोपमितसमासानुशासनात् । अब्जस्य च वीक्षणो[६]पयोगित्वं न स्वात्मना संभवति । अतः प्रकृतदृगात्म-

१- 'च' इत्यधिकं खपुस्तके २- श्रुत्यन्त्यलेखन--ख ३- चक्रे भ्रमणे-ग,घ
४- तथैव ति इति-ख ५- केशः-ख ६- तत्र-क,खग ७- वीक्ष्यमाणोप--क
८- उपमितसमासा--ग ६- वीक्षमाणो--क

तापत्त्यपेक्षणात्परिणामालंकार: । नन्वेवं "यामि मनोवाक्कायै:" इत्यादिष्वपि तरणादिशब्दलक्षितजन्मनाशाद्युपयोगित्वं तरण्यादीनामंघ्रिद्वयाद्यात्मनैवेति तेष्वपि परिणामप्रसंग: । मैवम् । यस्य कार्यवाचिपदप्रथमप्रतीततन्मुख्यार्थनि[1]र्वर्तनसामर्थ्यं तदात्मनोपयोगित्वस्य ग्राह्यत्वात् । तरण्यादिपदमुख्यार्थ[2]-[3]निवर्तनसामर्थ्यस्य च तरण्यादिष्वेव व्यवस्थितत्वात् । तस्मादुदाहृतेषु रूपकमेव । तेषु च नातिव्याप्तिरिति । नन्वेवमुक्तातिव्याप्तिपरिहारे[4]ऽपि--

"सोऽपूर्वो रसनाविपर्ययविधिस्तत्कर्णयोश्चापलं
दृष्टि: सा मदविस्मृत[5]स्वपरदिक्किं भूयोसोक्तेन वा ।
[6]सर्वं [7]विस्मृतवानसि भ्रमर हे यद्वारणोऽद्याप्यसा-
वन्त: शून्यकरोऽपि सेव्यत इति भ्रात: क एष ग्रह: ।।"

इत्यप्रस्तुतप्रशंसायामतिव्याप्ति: । तत्राप्रकृतवारणरसनाविपर्ययादीनां प्रकृतदुष्प्रभुरसनाविपर्ययाद्यात्मतयैव तत्सेवात्यागलक्षणकार्योपयोगित्वात् । न हि यथा वारणस्य कर्णचापलं भ्रमरस्य तत्सेवात्यागे हेतु: तथा[8] तस्य रसनाविपर्यय: शून्यकरता[9] च तत्र हेतु: । मद: प्रत्युत तत्सेवायामेव हेतुरिति तस्य तत्यागहेतुत्वं दूरापास्तम् । एवमपि यद्येषां त्यागहेतुत्वं निबध्यते तद्वारणादीनामप्रकृतानां दुष्प्रभुप्रभृतितादात्म्यापत्त्यैव निर्वाह्यमिति । "सुहृदालापेनैव" इत्यत्रोदाहृतपरिणामेऽ[10]व्याप्तिश्च तदवस्था । तत्र चन्द्रवन्मुखस्याप्यप्रकृतत्वेन प्रकृतात्मनोपयोगित्वाभावात् । उच्यते । प्रकृतात्मनेत्यत्र प्रकृतशब्दो विषयमात्रपर इति नोदाहृतपरिणामाव्याप्ति: । उपयोगित्वं च प्रकृतागमकार्यं प्रति विवक्षितम् । अप्रस्तुतप्रशंसोदाहरणे प्रकृतदुष्प्रभुसेवात्यागम[11]कवारणसेवात्यागं प्रत्युपयोगित्वमिति न तत्रा[12]-तिव्याप्ति: । एवं च ---

"आरोप्यमाणमारोपविषयात्मतया स्थितम् ।
प्रकृतस्योपयोगि स्यात्परिणाम उदाहृत: ।।"

---

१- निर्वनसामर्थ्यं-ख २- तरणादिपदं-क,ख ३- निर्वर्तनसामर्थ्यस्य-ख ४- --परिहार:-ख (अपि इतिनास्ति) ५- विस्मृत-ख ६- पूर्वं-ख ७- निश्चितवानसि-ख ८- यथा-घ ९- त्यागहेतुत्वं-क १०- परिणामाव्याप्ति:-क ख,ग ११- गमकं-ख, १२- अपि इत्यधिकं खपुस्तके।

इति विद्यानाथलक्षणं प्रकृतस्येति पदस्य प्रकृतगमकस्येति व्याख्यानेन परिष्करणीयम् ।।

अयं च परिणामो द्विविधः । सामानाधिकरण्यवैयधिकरण्याभ्याम् ।

सामानाधिकरण्येन यथा--

"तीर्त्वा भूतेशमौलिस्रजममरधुनीमात्मनासौ तृतीय-
स्तस्मै सौमित्रिमैत्रीमयमुपकृतवानातरं नाविकाय ।
व्यामग्राह्यस्तनीभिः शबरयुवतिभिः कौतुकोदञ्चदक्षं
कृच्छ्रादन्वीयमानः क्षणमचलमथो चित्रकूटं प्रतस्थे ।।"

अत्रारोप्यमाण आतरो विषयभूतसौमित्रिमैत्री[1]रूपतापत्त्या गुहोपकारलक्षणकार्योपयोगीति परिणामः। उभयोर्विभक्त्यैक्यात्सामानाधिकरण्यम् ।

वैयधिकरण्येन यथा--

"पुन्नागजालकैर्हारान्काञ्ची[2]: केयूर[3]दामभिः ।
कर्णिकाः कर्णिकारैश्च विहर्तुं विदधुर्वने ।।"

अत्रारोप्यमाणा हारादयो विषयभूतपुन्नागजालकादिरूपतयैव वनक्रीडोपयोगिन इति परिणामः । विभक्तिभेदाद्वैयधिकरण्यम् ।

[4]इदं च वैयधिकरण्यं रूपकेऽपि संभवति । यथा--

"तारानायकशेखराय जगदाधाराय धाराधर-
च्छायाधारकन्धराय गिरिजासङ्गै[5]कशृङ्गारिणे ।
नद्या शेखरिणे दृशा तिलकिने नारायणेनास्त्रिणे
नागैः कंकणिने नगेन गृहिणे नाथाय सेयं नतिः ।।"

अत्र नदीदृशोर्विषययोर्विभक्तिरारोप्यमाणयोः शेखरतिलकयोर्नास्ति ।

यथा वा--

"द्विर्भावः पुष्पकेतोर्विबुधविटपिना[6] पौन[रुक्त्यं] विकल्प-
श्चिन्तारत्नस्य वीप्सा तपनतनुभुवो वासवस्य द्विरुक्तिः ।
द्वैतं देवस्य दैत्याधिपमथनकलाकेलिकारस्य कुर्व-
न्नानन्दं कोविदानां जगति विजयते श्रीनृसिंहक्षितीन्द्रः ।।

---

१- मैत्री इति ख पुस्तके नास्ति २- काञ्चित्तु-ख ३- केसरदामभिः-क,ख
४- इदम् इत्यारभ्य रूपकेऽपि इत्यन्तं खपुस्तके नास्ति ५- दिविजासङ्गैक-ख ६- विटपिना-ख

अत्र विषयस्य राज्ञो विषयिणां पुष्पकेतुप्रभृतीनां च विभक्तिभेदः ।

अथ परिणामस्य व्यंग्यतायां किमुदाहरणम् ।

नरसिंहधरानाथ के वयं तव वर्णने ।
अपि राजानमाक्रम्य यशो यस्य विजृम्भते[1] ।। "

इति विद्याधरेणोदाहृतम् । अत्र राजपदेन चन्द्रे विषये निर्दिष्टे[2] तत्रारोप्यमाणस्य नृपस्याक्रमणरूपकार्योपयोगिनः प्रतीतेः परिणामो व्यज्यत इति, तदयुक्तम् । अत्र ह्यारोप्यमाणस्य नृपस्य[3] नृपात्मनैवाक्रमणोपयोगो[4] न चन्द्रात्मना । विद्याधरेणापि विषयिणः स्वरूपेण कार्यानुपयोगे[5] तदुपयोगाय विषयिणो[6] विषयात्मना परिणत्यपेक्षायामेव परिणामोऽङ्गीकृतः[7] । यदाह—

"तं परिणामं द्विविधं कथयन्त्यारोप्यमाणविषयतया ।
परिणमति यत्र विषयः[8] प्रस्तुतकार्योपयोगाय ।।"

[9]विद्यानाथेन तूदाहृतम् —

"एष शाम्यति बस्तापो राजपादनिषेवया ।
कण्टकद्रुममूलेषु[10] वासस्तं शमयेत्कथम् ।।" इति ।

नास्त्यत्र प्रागुक्तदोषानुषंगः । नृपचरणसेवायां प्रस्तुतायामारोप्यमाणायाः चन्द्रचरणसेवायाः[11] नृपचरणसेवात्मतयैव[12] तापशान्तिहेतुत्वात् । तापशब्दस्य सौरतापसाधारण्येऽपि प्रकृते राज्यभ्रंशजनिततापस्यैव विवक्षितत्वात् । तन्निवर्तने[13] चन्द्रकिरणसेवायाः स्वतोऽसामर्थ्यात् । तथापि प्राचीनानां मत एवैतदुदाहरणम् । ते हि "राजपादनिषेवया" इत्यस्य प्रकरणनियन्त्रितत्वादप्रकृतायां चन्द्रकिरणसेवायां शब्दशक्तिमूलो व्यञ्जनाव्यापार इति मन्यन्ते । वस्तुतस्त्वप्रकृतेऽप्यर्थे शब्दानामभिधैव[14] व्यापार इत्यस्माभिः श्लेषप्रकरणे व्यवस्थापयिष्यमाणत्वात्, इहापि "राजपादनिषेवया" इत्यत्र चन्द्रकिरणसेवायामप्यभिधैव[15][16] व्यापारः । अतः प्रस्तुताप्रस्तुतद्वयतादूप्यप्रतीतेः श्लेषभित्तिकातिशयोक्तयादिष्विव[17] संसर्गविधयैव लाभात्तस्य प्रकृतकार्योपयोगितायास्तृतीयया[18] लाभाच्च न क्वापि व्यञ्जनाव्यापारापेक्षेति[19] नेदं परिणामध्वनेरुदाहरणम् । इदं च दूषणं पूर्वोदाहरणेऽपि तुल्यम् । इदं तूदाहरणम्[20]—

---

१- विजृम्भते:-ख २- विषयनिर्दिष्टेग्ख ३- नृपत्य इति ख पुस्तकेनास्ति ४- वाक्रमणोरूपयगेन-ख ५- कार्यानुपयोगो-ग ६- विषयस्य-ख ७- अंगीकृता:ख ८- विषयी-क ९- इति इत्यधिकं खपुस्तके १०-कन्टकि-क, कुन्टकी-ख ११-चन्द्रकिरण-क,चन्द्रकिरणासेवाया-ख-१२- नृपतिचरण-क ख १३- तन्निवर्तनेच-क,ख १४- मभिधेयव्यापार-ख १५- अपि इति क पु०नास्ति १६- अभिधैव इति खपुस्तकेनास्ति १७-श्लेषभित्तिकाभेदध्यवसायमूलकातिशयोक्त्यादिष्विव-क,ख १८- तृतीयाया-ख,घ-१९-व्यंजनव्यापारा--ख-
२०- तु इति ख पुस्तकेनास्ति

'चिराद्विषहसे तापं चित्त चिन्तां परित्यज ।
नन्वस्ति शीतलः शौरेः पादाब्जनखचन्द्रमाः ।।'

अत्र चिरतापार्तं प्रति हरिपादाब्जनखचन्द्रसद्भावप्रदर्शनेन तमेव निषेवस्व, तन्निषेवणादयं तापः शान्तिमेष्यतीति परिणामो व्यज्यते । एवं रूपकवैलक्षण्ये[1] परिणामो निरूपितः । तत्र रूपके प्रकृतमप्रकृतरूपापन्नं[2] भवति, परिणामे त्वप्रकृतं प्रकृतरूपापन्नं भवतीति वैलक्षण्ये स्थिते यत्तदुपजीव्यत्वकवर्तिनान्यथैव[3] तयोर्वैलक्षण्यं वर्णितम् । मुखचन्द्र इति रूपके मुखं महारजतरूपेण[4] पटवदारोप्यमाणचन्द्ररूपेण स्थगितस्वरूपं भवति । मुखचन्द्रेण तापः शाम्यति' इति परिणामे तु मुखमनाच्छादितस्वरूपमेव भवति । चन्द्रस्य मुखात्मनैव विरहतापशान्तिहेतुत्वादिति । उक्तं च --

'विषय्याकारमारोप्य विषयस्थगनं यथा[5] ।
रूपकत्वं तदा तत्र रञ्जनेन समन्वयः[6] ।।'
'यदा तु विषयो रूपात्स्वस्मादप्रच्युतो भवेत् ।
उपयुक्त्यै तदाकारः परिणामस्तदा मतः ।।' इति ।

अत्रेदं विचारणीयम् । रूपके विषयस्य स्थगनं न तावत्तिरोहितरूपत्वम् । रजतभ्रमेण शुक्तिस्वरूपस्येवाहार्यारोपेण विषयस्य तिरोधानासंभवात् । शारीरके च 'य एवासौ, तपति तमुद्गीथमुपासीत इत्यत्रोद्गीथस्यादित्यदृष्टिविषयत्वांगीकारे रजतदृष्टिविषयशुक्तिस्वरूपमिवोद्गीथक्रियास्वरूपं[7] तिरोधीयेतेत्याशंक्याहार्यदृष्टेरतिरोधायकत्वस्योक्तत्वात् । नापि विषय्युपसर्जनत्वम् । परिणामेऽपि तुल्यत्वात् । उभयत्राप्युत्तरपदार्थप्रधानस्य मयूरव्यंसकादिसमासस्याविशेषात् । अत एव विषयिविशेषितत्वं स्थगनमित्यपि निरस्तम् । विषयिणो विशेष्यत्वात् । तस्मात्स्थगनास्थगनवैलक्षण्यवचो निरालम्बनमिति विषयात्मनोपयोगेनैव परिणामस्य रूपकाद्वैलक्षण्यं समर्थनीयमित्यलं विस्तरेण ।।

इति[8] परिणामप्रकरणम्[9] ।

---

१- वैलक्षण्येन-ख २- प्रकृतं प्रकृतरूपा--ख ३- तदप्युपजीव्य-क,ख
४- महारजन-क, ख,ग ५- यदा-क,ख ६- समन्वतः (?) -क ७- स्वरूप-क
८- इति इति पु० नास्ति ९- चित्रमीमांसायाम् इत्यधिकं क-गयोः

अथ ससंदेह:-

साम्यादप्रकृतार्थस्य या धीरनवधारणा ।
प्रकृतार्थाश्रया तज्ज्ञै: ससंदेह: स इष्यते[१] ।।

त्रिविधश्चायं ससंदेह:[२] । शुद्धो निश्चयगर्भो निश्चयान्तश्च । क्रमेण यथा--

आनीय क्षिणता धनानि विपिने राजन्यचूडामणौ
तेष्वालोक्य विनिर्मलं हिमकलाखण्डं[३] करण्डं पुन: ।
किं वाधं किमु पैणणं किमु धनं किं दोपणीयायुधं
किं वा[४] दैवतमित्यनिश्चितधियो मन्दा: पुलिन्दा जना:॥

"अयं मार्तण्ड: किं स खलु तुरगै: सप्तभिरित:
कृशानु: किं सर्वा: प्रसरति दिशो नैव[५] नियतम्[६] ।
कृतान्त: किं साक्षान्महिषवहनोऽसाविति चिरं
समालोक्याजौ त्वां विदधति विकल्पान्प्रतिभटा: ।।"

किं तावत्सरसि सरोजमेतदारा-
दाहोस्विन्मुखमवभासते तरुण्या:[७] ।
संशय्य क्षणमिति निश्चिकाय कश्चि-
द्बिब्बोकैर्बकसहवासिनां[८] परोक्षै: ।।"

इति वदन्ति । अत्रेदं विचारणीयम् । साम्यादिति किमन्नाद्धेतोर्वसतीतिवत्फलत्वेन हेतुत्वविवक्षया पञ्चमी, उत स्वतो हेतुत्वविवक्षया । आद्येऽप्रकृतसाम्याभिव्यक्तिफलकत्वमर्थ: स्यात् । तथा सति आनीय क्षिणताम्" इत्याद्युदाहरणेऽव्याप्ति: । न हि तत्र हिमकरण्डस्य वाधादिसादृश्याभिव्यक्तौ कविसंरम्भ: । किं तु क्षिणत्पुरमीदृशीमवस्थामापन्नमिति राज्ञ: प्रतापातिशयाभिव्यक्तौ । द्वितीये साम्यादित्यनेन किमेकमेवाप्रकृतसाम्यं यावत्संदेहाकोट्युच्छित्तिहेतुत्वेन[९] विवक्षितम्, उतैकमनेकं वेत्यनियम:[१०] । आद्ये "अयं मार्तण्ड: किम्" इत्याद्युदाहरणेऽव्याप्ति: । नहि तत्र "किं लक्ष्मीरुर्वशी वेयं रम्भा वा मेनका वा" इत्यत्र लक्ष्मीत्यादिविक[११]ल्पेष्वतिशयितसौन्दर्यसाम्यवदेकमेव साम्यमिह मार्तण्डत्वादिविकल्पेषु हेतु:

---

१- उच्यते-क २- संदेह:-ख ३- हिमजलाखंड-ख ४- वोदे (?), --क ५- नैष-क,ख
६- नियता:- ख ७- सुवत्या:-क, ख, ग ८- वलसहवासिना-ख ९- कोव्युत्स्थितिहेतुत्वेन क,ख १०- येत्यनियम:-घ ११- लक्ष्मीत्वादि क,ख

किं तु प्रतापेन दुर्निरीक्षत्वसाम्यं[1] मार्तण्डत्वविकल्पे, दुराधर्षत्वसाम्यं कृशानुत्वविकल्पे, [2]क्षणेन सकलसंहर्तृत्वसाम्यं[3] कृतान्तत्वविकल्पे[4] च हेतुः । द्वितीये "इह नमय शिरः कलिंगवद्वा समरमुखे करहाटवद्धनुर्वा" इति विकल्पालंकारेऽतिव्याप्तिः ।

अत्र दिग्विजयप्रवृत्तेन बलवता राज्ञा समरे प्रसक्ते यथा कलिंगनृपतिः--

"समाक्रान्तो बलवता कांक्षन्नप्रंशिनीं[5] श्रियम् ।
श्रयेत[6] वैतसीं वृत्तिं न भौजंगीं[7] कदाचन ।।"

इति नीतिमनुसृत्यासंदिग्धं निजराज्यलक्ष्मीभ्रंशपरिहारकामः शिरो नमितवान्, तथा वा शिरो नमय, यथा करहाटनृपतिः "जयेन लभ्यते लक्ष्मीर्मरणेन सुरांगना[8]" इति नीतिमनुसृत्य युद्धकामो धनुर्नमितवान्, तथा वा धनुर्नमयेति समयोचिताप्तोपदेशे तद्राजचरितदृष्टान्तप्रापितानवस्थिताधीसत्त्वात् । न च तत्र श्लोके तादृग्धी[9]निबन्धनं नास्तीति नातिव्याप्तिरिति वाच्यम् । तन्निबन्धनस्यापि लक्षणान्तर्गतविवक्षायाम्--

"जीवनग्रहणे नम्रा गृहीत्वा पुनरुन्नताः ।
किं कनिष्ठाः किमु ज्येष्ठा घटीयन्त्रस्य दुर्जनाः ।।"

इत्यादिषु संदेहविषयनिबन्धनगम्यससंदेहालंकारेष्वव्याप्तिप्रसंगात् । उत्प्रेक्षायां वाच्यगम्यभेदवदिहापि द्विविधोदाहरणदर्शनेन वाच्यगम्यभेदेन द्वैविध्यस्यांगीकर्तव्यत्वात् ।

अपि चानवधारणेति किमुच्यते । अनिश्चयात्मकत्वमिति चेत् । तथा सति "बालेन्दुवक्राण्यविकाशभावात्[10]" इत्यादावुदाहरिष्यमाणायामप्रकृतसाम्यनिमित्त[11]तादात्म्यसंभावनारूपायामुत्प्रेक्षायामतिव्याप्तिः । [12]विरोधेन परस्परप्रतिक्षेपकतया निबद्धानेककोट्यवगाहित्वं विवक्षितमिति चेत् तथापि "अंकं केऽपि शशंकिरे" इत्यादावुदाहरिष्यमाणायामपह्नुताव[13]तिव्याप्तिः । संदेहविकल्पयोर्वाकारादिनेव तत्रापि तदन्यत्वोपन्यासेन[14] परस्परप्रतिक्षेपसिद्धेः ।

---

१- मार्तण्डविकल्पे-क, मार्ताण्डविकल्पे--ख २- क्षणेण इत्यस्य क्षणे इति ख पुस्तके नास्ति, ३- संहर्तृकत्वसाम्यं-ग ४- कृतान्तुविकल्पे-क,ग,घ ५- अप्रशनीं (?) क ६- श्रयते-ख ७- भौजंगी-ख ८- सुरांगना इति ख पुस्तके नास्ति ९- तादधीनि-ख, १०- विकासतोवात्-ख, विकासभावात्-ग ११- निमित्ततादा--ख १२- अथ, संभावनायाउत्कटकोटिसंदेहरूपत्वात् विरुद्धानेककोट्यवगाहित्वं वदिति चेत् तथापि मुखचन्द्र इत्यादि रूपके ऽतिव्याप्तिः इत्यधिकं कपुस्तके १३- मपह्नुतावव्याप्तिः-ग १४- तन्मतत्वोप---क

"अस्या: सर्गविधौ[1] प्रजापतिरभूच्चन्द्रो तु कान्तिप्रद:[2]
श्रृंगारैकरस: स्वयं तु मदनो मासो नु पुष्पाकर: ।
वेदाभ्यासजड: कथं स विषयव्यावृत्तकौतूहलो[3]
निर्मातुं प्रभवेन्मनोहरमिदं रूपं पुराणो मुनि: ।।"

इति ससंदेहोदाहरणे नाव्याप्ति: । तत्र चन्द्रादीनां संदेहधर्मिणामेवानेकत्वम् । प्रकारस्तु सर्वत्र वर्णनीय[4]वनिताप्रष्ट्[5]त्वमेकमेवेत्यनेककोटिकत्वाभावात् । न च साम्यनिमित्त[6]त्वाभावान्न तत्र[7] ससंदेह:[8] । "क्वो गता सा क्व गता न जाने गृहं[9] गता मे हृदयं गता वा" इति संदेहो न संग्राह्य इति वाच्यम् । वर्णनीयनायिकाया: कान्त्या चन्द्रसाम्यं[10] सौरभसौकुमार्याभ्यां पुष्पसाम्यं च निमित्तीकृत्य किमस्या:[11] कान्तिनिधानभूतश्चन्द्र: स्वकान्तिसंपदा सृष्टा, उत पुष्पमास:[12] स्वकीयपुष्पसंपदेति संदेहनिबन्धनात् श्रृंगारैकरस: स्वयं तु मदन: इत्यंशस्य श्रृंगारविभ्रम[13]बाहुल्यमात्रपर्यवसायित्वेन किंचित्साम्यनिमित्तत्वाभावेऽपि चन्द्रवसन्तधर्मिकांशयोस्तन्निमित्त[14]त्वानिवारणात् ।

एवं च प्रकृतार्थाश्रयेत्येतदप्ययुक्तम् । उदाहृतसंदेहस्य वर्णनीयनायिकानाश्रयत्वेनाव्याप्तिरिति[15] चेत्, अत्र ब्रूम: ।

"बुद्धि: सर्वात्मनान्योन्याक्षेपि[16]नानार्थसंश्रया ।
सादृश्यमूला वार्थस्पृक्संदेहालंकृतिर्मता[17] ।।"

यद्यप्यन्योन्य[18]प्रतिक्षेपकविरुद्धनानार्थावलम्बनत्वं विकल्पस्याप्यस्ति । तथापि तदर्थानां सर्वात्मना परस्परप्रतिक्षेपकत्वं नास्ति किं तु पक्षे तत्प्राप्तिमनिरुध्य[19] स्वप्राप्तिपक्ष एव स्वपरिपन्थिप्राप्तिप्रतिक्षेपकत्वम् । न हि "व्रीहिभिर्यवैर्वा[20] यष्टव्यम्" इति विकल्पोद्देशे व्रीहयो यवान् यवाश्च व्रीहीन्सर्वात्मना प्रसंगात्प्रतिक्षिपन्ति । तथा सति शास्त्रस्यास्य[21] निर्णायकत्वेनानतुष्ठापकत्वेन चाप्रामाण्यप्रसंगात् किं तु स्वस्वानुष्ठानपक्ष एव । अत एव "व्रीहिभिर्यवैर्वा यष्टव्यम्" इति संदेहेन पृष्टवन्तं प्रति "व्रीहिभिर्यवैर्वा यष्टव्यम्" इति प्रश्नसमाकारमेव वाक्यं निर्णायकं प्रश्नमूलसंदेह[22]निवर्तकमनुष्ठापकं च दृश्यते । प्रश्नवाक्ये वाकार: सर्वात्मना पक्षान्तरप्रतिक्षेपार्थ: । उत्तरवाक्ये पक्षे तत्प्रतिक्षेपार्थ इति विशेषसद्भावात् । एवं विकल्पालंकारोदाहरणेऽपि द्विविधस्यापि[23] नीतिशास्त्रस्य प्रामाण्याद्धुपदिष्टफले-

---

१- सर्गधौ-ख २- कान्तप्रद: ख ३- कौतूहले-ख ४- वर्णनाय ख ५- वनिप्रष्टु--ख
६- साम्यनिमित्त्वात्-ख ७- तत्र इति कखयो: नास्ति ८- संदेह:-क ९- गेहे-क
१०- कान्तिचन्द्रसामो-ख ११- किमस्या:-क १२- पुष्पसमय:-क, पुष्पसमस्वकीय--ख
१३- श्रृंगारविद्रुम (?)-ख १४- स्तनिमित्त-क १५- --नाव्याप्तेरिति-क १६-
अन्योन्यक्षेपि-क १७- --लंकृतिस्तु, सा-क, संदेहालंकार । -ख १८- यद्यन्योन्य--ख
१९- --मनिरुध्य-ग २०- व्रीहियवैर्वा-क २१- अस्य इति क पुस्तके नास्ति २२- प्रश्नमूलक-क २३- द्विविधस्यापि इति क पुस्तके नास्ति

च्छानुसारेणोभयमपि पक्षोऽनुष्ठातुं युक्तमिति शिरोधनुर्नमनयोर्न सर्वात्मना परस्परप्रतिक्षेपकत्वमिति विकल्पालंकारे नातिव्याप्तिः। अपह्नुवोदाहरणे सर्वात्मना परस्परप्रतिक्षेपकत्वेऽपि वाकारार्थस्पर्शाभावान्नातिव्याप्तिः। तत्र हि केचिदन्य इति मतान्तरत्वो[1]पन्यासेन पक्षाणां परस्परप्रतिक्षेपलाभः। न तु वाकारार्थस्पर्शोऽस्ति। उत्प्रेक्षायामपि नातिव्याप्तिः। तत्र[2] ह्युत्कटको-टिके[3] संशयकोट्योः समबलत्वाभावेन वाका[4]रार्थस्पर्शाभावात्। अस्याः सर्ग-विधौ" इत्युदाहरणे परस्परप्रतिक्षेपकानाकोटिसमाश्रयत्वाभावेऽपि तथाभूत-नानाधर्मिरूपार्थसमाश्रयत्वसत्त्वान्नाव्याप्तिरिति सर्वमन[5]वद्यम्।

संदेहालंकारध्वनिर्यथास्मत्कुलकूटस्थवक्षःस्थलाचार्यकृते वरदराजवसन्तो-त्सवे---

"का[6]श्चित्काञ्चनगौरांगीं वीक्ष्य साक्षादिव श्रियम्।
वरदः संशयापन्नो वक्षःस्थलमवैक्षत॥"

अत्र संशयस्य शब्दोपात्तत्वेऽपि तावन्मात्रस्यानलंकारत्वात्।

तदलंकारताप्रयोजकस्य वक्षःस्थले स्थि[7]तैव लक्ष्मीस्ततोऽवतीर्य पुरत-स्तिष्ठतीत्येवं संशयाकारस्य वक्षःस्थलमवैक्षतेत्यनेन व्यंग्यत्वात्संदेहालंका-रध्वनिरत्रेति। यथा--

"दर्पणे च परिभोगदर्शिनी पृष्ठतः प्रणयिनो निषेदुषः।
वीक्ष्य बिम्बमनु बिम्बमात्मनः कानि कान्यपि चकार लज्जया॥

इत्यत्र कानि कान्यपीति सामान्यतो निर्दिष्टानुभावविशेषप्रतीत्यर्थं[8] ल-ज्जाशब्दप्रयोगेऽपि तस्याः स्वविभावानुभावाभ्यां रसानुगुणाभिव्यक्तिरूपो ध्वनिः। यद्यपि संशयापन्नः इत्यनेन लक्ष्म्याः पुरो दृष्टायाश्च मध्ये कस्या रूपमधिकमिति संशयाविष्ट इति वा, निःसमाधिकरूपत्वा[9]भिमानिनी लक्ष्मीः[10] पुरत एनां दृष्ट्वा कथं वर्तत इति संशयापन्न इति वा, इयं च[11] व-क्षसि कुत्र निवेशनीयेति संशयापन्न इति वा। बहवः संशयाकारा वक्षः-स्थलमवैक्षतेत्यनेन व्यंग्याः संभवन्ति, तथापि सर्वेषामपि संदेहानां सादृ-श्यमूलत्वाद्व्यतिरेकमूलसंदेहस्याप्यत्र संभवेऽपि कथंचित्सादृश्यमूलत्वात्सं-देहालंकारध्वन्युदाहरणत्वमिति युक्तमेव॥

इति[12] संदेहालंकारप्रकरणम्।

---

१- मतान्तरोपन्यासेन-क २- "हि केचिदन्य इत्युत्कटको"-इत्यधिकं ख पुस्तके ३- संशये इत्यधिकं क पुस्तके ४- वाकारार्थ-घ- ५- सर्वमनवद्यम-ख, सर्वमवदातम-घ ६- कश्चित्-ख ७- स्थिले स्थिले (?) -ख ८---- प्रतीत्यर्थलज्जा--क ६- रूपत्वाभि-मानिनी-ख १०- लक्ष्मा:-ख, ११- च इति क-ख-ग-पुस्तकेषुनास्ति १२-चित्रमीमांसायां (चि० इत्थं प्रदर्शितं ख पुस्तके) इत्यधिकं ख-गयोः।

अथ भ्रान्तिमान्--

कविसंमतसादृश्याद्विषये पिहितात्मनि ।

आरोप्यमाणानुभवो यत्र स भ्रान्तिमान्मतः ।।

पिहितात्मनीत्यनेनारोप्यमाणानुभवस्य स्वारसिकं[1] कविप्रतिभया कल्पनं विवक्षितम् । तस्यैव विषयपिधानसामर्थ्यात् । अतो रूपकादौ नातिव्याप्तिः । [2]उदाहरणम्--

"कपाले मार्जारः पय इति कराँल्लेढि शशिन-

स्तरुच्छिद्रप्रोतान्बिसमिति करी संकलयति ।

रतान्ते तल्पस्थान्हरति वनिताप्यंशुकमिति

प्रभामत्त[3]श्चन्द्रो जगदिदमहो विभ्रमयति[4] ।।"

अत्र लेहनादिप्रवृत्तिपर्यन्तोक्तैः स्वारसिक एव विभ्रमः कविप्रतिभया चन्द्रिकोत्कर्षद्योतनाय निबद्धः ।

क्वचिद्भ्रान्तेरुत्तरोत्तरं पल्लवेन चमत्कारः-

बल्लालक्षोणिपाल त्वदहितनगरे संचरन्ती किराती

कीर्णान्यादाय रत्नान्युरुतरखदिराङ्गारशंकाकुलांगी[5] ।

कृत्वा श्रीखण्डखण्डं[6] तदुपरि मुकुलीभूतनेत्रा[7] धमन्ती

श्वासामोदानु[8]धावन्मधुकरनिकरैर्धूमशंकां करोति ।।

क्वचिद्भिन्नकर्तृकोत्तरोत्तरभ्रान्तिनिबन्धनेन चमत्कारः ।

शिञ्जानैर्मञ्जरीति स्तनकलशयुगं चुम्बितं[9] चंचरीकै-

स्त्त्रासो[10]ल्लासलोलाः किसलयमनसा पाणयः कीरदष्टाः ।

तल्लोपायालपन्त्यः पिकनिनदधिया ताडिताः काकलोकै-

रित्थं चोलेन्द्रसिंह त्वदरिमृगदृशां नाप्यरण्यं शरण्यम् ।।"

क्वचिदन्योन्यविषयभ्रान्तिनिबन्धनेन । यथा--

"पलाशकुसुमभ्रान्त्या शुकतुण्डे पतत्यलिः ।

सोऽपि जम्बूफलभ्रान्त्या तमलिं धर्तुमिच्छति[11] ।।"

---

१- स्वारसिककविप्रतिभया -ख २- उदाहरणम् इति खपुस्तके नास्ति
३- प्रभामतश्चन्द्रो-क, प्रभामर्तश्चन्द्रो-ख ४- भ्रमयति -ख ५- --शंकाकुलांगी-क
६- श्रीखण्ड खण्ड-क ७- --नेत्र--क,ख ८- --मोदानिलात्तैर्मधुकर--ख ९-
चुम्बितु-क १०- स्तत्रासोल्लास-क १२- हर्तुमिच्छति-क,ख

'विस्फूर्तिमत्या कीर्तो ते विधिवैकुण्ठशंकरा: ।
आरोढुं शयितुं वस्तुमाकाङ्क्षन्ति महीतले[1] ।।'

इत्यत्र भ्रान्तिमदलंकारो व्यंग्य: ।

सादृश्यान्यमूलौ संदेहविभ्रमौ[2] ससंदेहभ्रान्तिमदलंकारप्रयोजकौ न भवत: । यथा--

'अमुष्य धीरस्य जयाय साऽसी शरासनज्यां विशिखै: सनाथयन् ।
निमज्जयामास यशांसि संशये स्मरस्त्रिलोकीविजयार्जितान्यपि ।।'

'दामोदरकराघातचूर्णिताशेषवक्षसा ।
दृष्टं चाणूरमल्लेन शतचन्द्रं नमस्तलम्[3] ।।'

आद्ये दुर्गविजयोद्योगसाहसप्रयुक्त: कीर्तिभ्रंशसंदेह: । द्वितीये गाढमर्मप्रहारकृतचन्द्रविभ्रम इति ।

इति भ्रान्तिमत्प्रकरणम्[4] ।

अथोल्लेखालंकार:--

निमित्तभेदादेकस्य वस्तुनो यदनेकधा ।
उल्लेखनमनेकेन तमुल्लेखं प्रचक्षते ।।

यत्र नानाविधधर्मयोग्यैकं वस्तु तत्तद्धर्मयोगरूपनिमित्तभेदादनेकेन गृहीत्रानेकधोल्लिख्यते स उल्लेख: ।

'कीर्तिगंगाहिमक्ष्माभृदोज: सूर्योदयाचल: ।
शत्रुसेनाब्धिमन्थाद्रिर्गुणरत्नैकरोहण:[5] ।।'

इति मालारूपके एकस्य राज्ञो यशस्वित्वादिधर्मयोगरूपनिमित्तभेदाद्गुणाकरत्वाद्यनेकप्रकारेणोल्लेखनमस्तीति तत्रातिव्याप्तिनिरासायानेकेनेत्युक्तम्[6] । तत्र गृहीतृभेदनिबन्धनं न भवत्यनेकधोल्लेखनमिति नातिव्याप्ति: ।

'विद्याविक्रमसौन्दर्यतपसां निधिमागतम् ।
पश्यन्ति[7] विबुधा: शूरा: स्त्रियो वृद्धाश्च कौतुकात् ।।'

इत्यत्रैकस्य वर्ण्यस्य विद्याद्यनेकधर्मयोगरूपनिमित्तभेदादनेकेन[8] गृहीत्रो-

---

१- महीतले इति स पुस्तकेनास्ति २- संदेहभ्रान्ति--क--३- नभस्तलं-क ४- चित्रमीमांसायाम् इत्यधिकं गपुस्तके ५- गुणरत्नाधिरोहण:-क,ख६- नेकेनेत्युक्तम्-ग ७- अपश्यन्-क ८- रूपद्वय-क

ल्लेखनमस्तीति तत्रातिव्याप्तिवारणायानेकधेत्युक्तम् । तत्र कौतुकात्स्वरूपाव[1]-लोकनमात्रनिबन्धनं नानेकधो[2]ल्लेखनमिति तट्टीकावृत्तिः । शिञ्जानैर्मञ्जरीति स्तनकलशयुगं चुम्बितं[3] चञ्चरीकैः इत्युदाहृतायामनेककर्तृकभ्रान्तिपरम्परायां स्तनादीनां मञ्जरीसादृश्यादिनिमित्तभेदादनेकेन चञ्चरीकादिना मञ्जरीत्वाद्यनेकप्रकारेणोल्लेखनमस्तीति तत्रातिव्याप्तिवारणायैकस्य वस्तुन इत्युक्तम् ।

कीर्तौ विस्फूर्तिमत्यां ते मृणालदीरशंकिनः ।
द्वयेऽपि नागास्तन्वन्ति जिह्वान्तोल्लेखनं[4] मुहुः ।।

इति भ्रान्तिमदुदाहरणे[5] एकस्या एव कीर्तेरनेकेन कुञ्जरभुजंगरूपेण गृहीत्रा मृणालदीररूपत्वाद्यनेकप्रकारे[6]णोल्लेखनमस्तीति तत्रातिव्याप्तिनिरासाय निमित्तभेदादित्युक्तम् । तत्र कीर्तिगतं धावल्यमेकमुल्लेखद्वयेऽपि निमित्तम् । यद्यपि गजभुजंगानां स्वस्वप्रियाहारलोभरूपनिमित्तभेदोऽप्यस्ति, तथापि निमित्तभेदादित्यनेनैकनिमित्तविरहो विवक्षित इति तद्व्याख्यावृत्तिः[7] । तस्य संग्राह्यत्वे[8] निमित्तभेदादिति स्वरूपकथनमात्रम् । एवमपि यदि---

कान्त्या चन्द्रं विदुः केचित्सौरभेणाम्बुजं परे ।
वक्त्रं तव वयं ब्रूमस्तपसैक्यं गतं[9] द्वयम् ।।

इत्यपह्नवोदाहरणविशेषेऽतिव्याप्तिः शंक्या, तदानीमनेकधोल्लेखनं निषेधास्पृष्टत्वेन विशेषणीयम् । तत्राद्योल्लेखनद्वयं परमतत्वोपन्याससामर्थ्याद्गम्यमाननिषेधमिति नातिव्याप्तिः ।[10]

[11]स्त्रीभिः कामोऽर्थिभिः स्वर्द्रुः कालः शत्रुभिरैक्षि सः ।

अत्र चानेकधोल्लेखने रुच्यर्थित्वभयादिकं यथायोगं प्रयोजकम् ।। रुचिरभिरतिः, अर्थित्वं लिप्सा । द्विविधश्चायमुल्लेखः शुद्धोऽलंकारान्तरसंकीर्णश्च । तत्र शुद्धो यथा--

[12]गजत्रातेति वृद्धाभिः श्रीकान्त इति यौवतैः ।
यथास्थितश्च बालाभिर्दृष्टः शौरिः सकौतुकम् ।।

अत्र यस्तथा भीतं मत्तं गजं त्वरया त्रायते स्म सोऽयमादिपूरुष इति

---

१- स्वरूपालोक--क,ख,ग २- नानेकधो-घ ३- चुम्बितुं-क ४- जिह्वान्तोल्लोलनं-क, जिह्वान्तोल्लिखन-ख, ५- मदुदाहरणे इत्यारभ्य निरासाय (पर्यन्तो), इत्यन्तं ख पुस्तकेनास्ति ६- रूपत्वानेक-क ७- व्याख्यावृ तस्य --ख ८- अथ इत्यधिकं सपुस्तके ६- गतद्वयम-ख १०- उदाहरणम् इत्यधिकं कपुस्तके ११- स्त्रीभिः इत्यारभ्य सः इत्यन्तं सपुस्तकेनास्ति १२- जगत्त्रातेति-ख

वृद्धाभि: संसाराद्भीत्या[1] तद्भयार्थिनीभि: कृष्ण: पुर:[2] प्रविशन्[3] दृष्ट: यस्तथा चपलत्वेन प्रसिद्धाया लक्ष्म्या अपि कामोपचारवैदग्ध्येन नित्यवल्लभः सोऽयं दिव्यस्त्रुवेति युवतीभि: सोत्कण्ठाभिर्दृष्ट:, बालाभिर्बालस्वभावाद्यथास्थितरूपवेषयुक्तो दृष्ट इति सर्वत्र वस्तुसता[4] नानारूपेणोल्लेखादयं शुद्ध: ।

यथा वा हर्षचरिते श्रीकण्ठजनपदवर्णने--

"यस्तपोवनमिति मुनिभि:, कामायतनमिति वेश्याभि:, संगीतशालेति लासकै:, यमनगरमिति शत्रुभि:, चिन्तामणिरित्यर्थिभि:, वीरक्षेत्रमिति शस्त्रोपजीविभि:, गुरुकुलमिति विद्यार्थिभि: गन्धर्वनगरमिति गायकै:,[5] विश्वकर्ममन्दिरमिति विज्ञानिभि:, लाभभूमिरिति वैदेहकै:, धूर्तस्थानमिति वन्दिभि:, साधुसमागम इति सद्भि:, वज्रपञ्जरमिति शरणागतै:, विटगोष्ठीति[6] विदग्धै:, सुकृतपरिणाम इति पथिकै:, असुरविवरमिति वाहिकै:,[7] शाक्याश्रम[8] इति शमिभि:, अप्सर:पुरमिति कामिभि:, महोत्सवसमाज इति चारणै:, वसुधारेति च विप्रैरगृह्यत ।"

अत्र तपोवनादिभूयिष्ठत्वात्तपोवनाद्युल्लेख:[9] शुद्ध: । अत्रैव यमनगरत्वाद्युल्लेख: संकीर्ण: । तत्र यदि यमनगरत्वादीनामुपरञ्जकतामात्रेणान्वयस्तदा रूपकसंकर: । यदि ताद्रूप्यानुभावगोचरतया, तदा भ्रान्तिमत्संकर: । अयं चोल्लेखो वर्ण्यगुणोत्कर्षख्यापनायाचेतनकर्तृकोऽपि निबध्यते । यथा तत्रैव हर्षवर्णने--

"नि:स्नेह इति घनै:, अनाश्रयणीय इति दोषै:, निग्रहरुचिरितीन्द्रियै:, दुरुपसर्प इति कलिना, नीरस[10] इति व्यसनै:, भीरुरित्ययशसा,[11] दुर्ग्रह-चित्तवृत्तिरिति चित्तभुवा, स्त्रीपर इति सरस्वत्या, षण्ढ इति परकलत्रै:, काष्ठामुनिरिति[12] यतिभि:, धूर्त इति वेश्याभि:, विनेय[13] इति सुहृद्भि:, कर्मकर इति विप्रै:, असहाय इति शत्रुयोधै:, एकमप्यनेकधा गृह्यमाणम्[14] इति ।

---

१- भीत्य-क २- पुरं-क,ख ३- प्राविशन-क ४- वस्तुसंतानरूपोल्लेखादयं-ख ५- गा विश्व-ख ६- वीरगोष्ठीति-ख ७- वादिकै:-क,ख ८- शक्याश्रम-घ ९- --भूयिष्ठत्वादुल्लेख: शुद्ध: -क १०- निरस इति-ख ११--- त्यपयशसा-ग १२- काष्ठमुनि-क,ख,ग १३- नेय-क,ख विनय-घ १४- एकमप्यनेकैर्गृह्यमाणम्-ख

भ्रान्तिमदलंकारादयोऽप्येवमचेतनकर्तृका निबध्यन्ते--

"भिन्नेषु रत्नकिरणैः किरणेष्विवेन्दो-[१]

रुच्चावचैरुपगतेषु सहस्रसंख्याम् ।

दोषापि नूनमहिमांशुरसौ किलेति

व्याकोशकोकनदतां दधते नलिन्यः[२] ॥" इत्यादौ ।

"मधुलुब्धा मधुकरास्तृषिताश्च चकोरकाः ।

सुगन्धि कान्तिसंपन्नमनुधावन्ति ते मुखम्[३] ॥"

इत्यत्रोल्लेखो व्यंग्यः । विद्याविक्रमसौन्दर्यं इति श्लोके विद्यादीनां स्वरूपावलोकनकौतुकमात्रे निमित्ततया यदि न विश्रान्तिः, किंतु विद्वत्ताद्युल्लेखवदवलोकनकौतुकनिमित्ततायां पर्यवसानं तदा तत्राप्युल्लेखनगतानेकधात्वविच्छित्तिविशेषस्य[४] गम्यत्वादुल्लेखालंकारो गम्यः ।

"परिव्राट्कामुकशुनामेकस्यामेव योषिति ।

कुणपः कामिनी भक्ष्यमिति तिस्रो विकल्पनाः ॥"

इत्यत्राप्युल्लेख इष्यत इति लक्षणस्य नातिव्याप्तिः ।

अथापर उल्लेखप्रकारः-

"गृहीतृभेदाभावेऽपि[५] विषयाश्रयभेदतः ।

एकस्यानेकधोल्लेखमप्युल्लेखं प्रचक्षते ॥"

तत्र विषयभेदादनेकधोल्लेखः शुद्धः संकीर्णश्च । शुद्धो यथा---

"अकृशं कुचयोः कृशं वलग्ने[६] विपुलं चक्षुषि विस्तृतं नितम्बे ।

अधरेऽरुणमाविरस्तु[७] चित्ते करुणाशालिकपालिभागधेयम् ॥"

"गुरुर्वचसि, पृथुरुरसि, विशालो मनसि, जनकस्तपसि, सुमित्रस्ते-[८]जसि, सुमंत्रो[९] रहसि, बुधः सदसि, अर्जुनो यशसि, भीष्मो धनुषि"

इत्यादौ श्लेषसंकीर्णः ।

"हंसमयीव गतिषु, परपुष्टमयीवालापे,[१०] चक्रवाकमयीव[११] पतिप्रेमणि, प्रावृण्मयीव[१२] पयोधरोन्नतौ, कमलमयीव कोशसंग्रहेषु, कुसुममयीव फलदानेषु इत्याद्युत्प्रेक्षासंकीर्णः । पयोधरोन्नतावित्यादौ विषयांशे श्लेषसंकीर्णश्च । युधिष्ठिरः सत्यवचसि" इत्यादौ रूपकसंकीर्णः ।

"युधिष्ठिरसमः सत्यवचसि इत्यादावुपमासंकीर्ण इत्याद्यून्नेयम् ।

---

१- ष्विहेन्दो-क, ग २- इत्यादौ इत्यधिकं क-ख-गपुस्तकेषु ३- सपन्न-घ
४- अनेकधात्वकृतः (?)-क ५- गृहीतृ-घ ६- विलग्ने-क,ख ७- अरुणाधरमाविरस्तु-क,ख
८- जामकः-ख ९- संमतो क,ख १०---वालापेषु-क,ख ११- चक्रवाकमयि(?)-ख
१२- प्रावृणमयीव-ख, प्राविण्मयीव-घ

अधिकरणभेदेनानेकधोल्लेखो यथा--

"वर्धिष्णोरुपरि क्षणं रविरभूच्छत्रं बलिध्वंसिनो
रत्नं मूर्ध्नि ललाटसीम्नि तिलकं कर्णान्तिके कुण्डलम् ।
अंसे चक्रपुर:स्थले मणिवरो नाभौ सरोजासनो
यस्यांघ्रौ कटकस्त्रिविक्रमगते: पायादपायात्स व: ।।"

अत्र रूपकसंकीर्ण: । भगवल्ललाटमध्यकर्णान्तादि[1]तत्तदवयवाभिमुख-स्थितगृहीतृभेदनिमित्तोल्लेखसंकीर्णश्च । एकस्यैव द्रष्टुर्ललाटमध्ये कर्णान्तिके च रविदर्शनासंभवात् ।

"यस्य वह्निमयो हृदयेषु,जलमयो लोचनपुटेषु[2], मारुतमय: श्वसितेषु, क्ष्माम[य]ोऽङ्गेषु, आकाशमय: शून्यतासु , पञ्चमहाभूतमयो मूर्त इवादृश्यत निहतप्रतिसामन्तान्त:पुरेषु प्रताप: ।"

अत्र वह्निजलादिशब्दगृहीततापबाष्पादि[3]रूपाणां प्रतापकार्याणां प्रतापस्य चाभेदकथनं हेत्वलंकार इति तत्संकर:।मतान्तरे रूपकसंकर: ।

"कस्तूरीतिलका[4]दि भालफलके, देव्या मुखाम्भोरुहे
रोलम्बन्ति[5], तमालबाल[6]मुकुलोत्तंसन्ति मौलिं प्रति ।
या: कर्णे विकचोत्पलन्ति, कुचयोरंसे[7] च कालागुरु-
स्थासयन्ति, प्रथयन्तु तास्तव शिवं श्रीकण्ठकण्ठत्विष: ।।"

अत्रोपमासंकीर्ण: । केचित् तत्तदधिकरणौचित्यात्[8]कस्तूरीतिलकादि-तादात्म्यसंभावनायामुपमार्थे[9] विहितोऽपि[10] क्विबुत्प्रेक्षायां[11] पर्यवस्यतीत्युपमो-पक्रमोत्प्रेक्षेयमित्याहु:।तन्मते उत्प्रेक्षासंकीर्ण: । एवमलंकारान्तरसंकरो-ऽप्युन्नेय: ।

इत्युल्लेखप्रकरणम्[12] ।

अथापह्नुति:-

प्रकृतस्य निषेधेन यदन्यत्वप्रकल्पनम् ।
साम्यादपह्नुतिर्वाक्यभेदाभेदवती द्विधा ।।

[13]अन्यत्वकल्पनमात्रं रूपके, विषयनिषेधमात्रं "नाहं दूती वरतनोरंग-

---

१- कर्णान्तिकादि-क २- लोचनपुटेषु-क, ३- बाष्पादिभ(राणां)-क,ख ४- कस्तूरीतिलकन्ति-क ५- लोलम्बन्ति-ख ६- बालमुकुल-क,ख ७- कुचयोरसि-क,ख,ग, ८- --धिकरणौचित्ता कस्तूरी-क ९- उपमार्था-ख १०-विहितापि-ख ११- अत्र इत्यधिकं क-खयो: १२- चित्र मीमांसायाम् इत्यधिकं गपुस्तके १३- प्रकल्पन -क

तापोऽति भास्वर:[1]" इत्यादौ पे, उभयमपि साम्यविशेषणरहितम् । "न पञ्च-विशिख: काम: किं त्वपञ्चशिलीमुख:[2]" इत्यतिशयोक्तौ चातिव्याप्तमिति विशिष्टोपादानम्[3] । न चैवं[4] "न पद्मं मुखमेवेदम्" इति तत्त्वाख्यानोपमाया विषये[5] पद्मत्वनिषेधस्य मुखत्वप्रकल्पनस्य च सत्त्वादतिव्याप्ति:[6] । प्रकल्पन-पदस्यारोपपरत्वात् । "निषिध्य[7] विषयं साम्यादन्यारोप:" इति त्वाप्[8]प्रत्यये-येन लक्षणं नोक्तम् । वक्ष्यमाणोदाहरणे आरोपपूर्वकापह्नवेऽव्याप्ति[9]-प्रसंगात् ।

इयं च साक्षान्निषेधकनञादिप्रयोगे परपदात्वाद्युपन्यासे निषेधसा[10]मार्थ्याद् गम्यत्वे च वाक्यभेदेन प्रवर्तते । विषयासत्यत्वप्रतिपादकच्छद्मनिभक-पटव्याजादिशब्दप्रयोगे विषयासत्यत्वपर्यवसायिरूपवपुर्नामिभंग्यादि शब्द-प्रयोगे च तदभेदेन ।

अत्र[11] वाक्यभेदेऽपह्नवपूर्वक आरोप आरोपपूर्वकापह्नवश्चेति द्वैविध्यम् ।

क्रमेणोदाहरणानि---

"अवाप्त: प्रागल्भ्यं परिणतरुच: शैलतनये
कलंको नैवायं विलसति शशांकस्य वपुषि ।
अमुष्येयं[12] मन्ये विगलदमृतस्यन्दशिशिरे[13]
रतिश्रान्ता[14] शेते रजनिरमणी गाढमुरसि ।।

यथा वा---

"नेदं नभोमण्डलमम्बुराशिर्नैताश्च[15] तारा नवफेनभंगा: ।
नायं शशी कुण्डलित: फणीन्द्रो नायं कलंक: शयितो मुरारि: ।।"

पूर्वत्र निरवयवापह्नुतिरत्र सावयवेति भेद: ।

"अंकं केऽपि शशंकिरे[16] जलनिधे: पंकं परे मेनिरे
सारंगं कतिचिच्च संजगदिरे भूच्छायमैच्छन्परे ।
इन्दौ यद्दलितेन्द्रनीलशकलश्यामं दरीदृश्यते
तत्सान्द्रं निशि पीतमन्धतमसं कुक्षिस्थमाचक्ष्महे ।।"

इत्यत्राप्यप[17]ह्नवपूर्वक आरोप: । अपह्नवस्तु परपदारोपन्यासादर्थसिद्ध: ।

---

१- भास्कर (?)-क २- त्वसंख्यशिली-क ३- निविष्टोपादानम्-ख ४-एवमपि-क-ख,ग ५- विषय-क,ख ६- अव्याप्ति:-- ख-७- निषिद्ध (?) ख ८- इति तु-क ९- अतिव्याप्ति-घ- १०- निषेधसामर्थ्यादि-घ ११- तत्र-क,ख १२- मन्य-ख १३-दमृतस्यन्दिशिशिरे-क,ख १४- रति:शान्ता-ख १५- --राशिर्नैताश्च-क,ख,ग १६- अस्य श्लोकस्य शशंकिरे इत्येतत्पर्यन्तमेव उद्धृतम् खपुस्तके १७- इत्यत्रापह्नव-क

'विकसदमरनारीनेत्रनीलाब्जषण्डा-
न्यधिवसति सदा यः संयमाधः-कृतानि ।
न तु रुचिरकलापे वर्तते यो मयूरे
वितरतु स कुमारो ब्रह्मचर्यश्रियं[1] वः ।।'

अत्रारोपपूर्वको[2]ऽपह्नवः शाब्दः ।

'मन्थानभूमिधरमूलशिलासहस्र-
संघट्टनव्रणकिणः स्फुरतीन्दुमध्ये ।
छाया मृगः शशक इत्यपि पामराणां[3]
लोके गतानुगतिकः प्रथितः प्रवादः ।।'

अत्राप्यारोपपूर्वकोऽपह्नवः । स च[4] पामरवचनोपन्यासादर्थसिद्धः । एतानि वाक्यभेदेनोदाहरणानि । एकवाक्यतायां तु-

'बत सखि कियदेतत्पश्य वैरं स्मरस्य
प्रियविरहकृशेऽस्मिन्कामिलोके तथा हि ।
उपवनसहकारोद्भासिभृंगच्छलेन[5]
प्रतिविशिखमनेनोट्टङ्कितं कालकूटम् ।।'

'अमुष्मिँल्लावण्यामृतसरसि नूनं मृगदृशः
स्मरः शर्वप्लुष्टः[6] पृथुजघनभागे निपतितः ।
यदङ्गाङ्गाराणां प्रशमपिशुना नाभिकुहरे
शिखा धूमस्येयं परिणमति रोमावलिवपुः ।।'

पूर्वत्र न सभृंगाणि सहकाराणि, अपि तु सकालकूटाः शरा इत्यस[7]त्यत्वाभिधायिच्छलशब्दवशात्प्रतीयते । उत्तरत्र नेयं रोमावलिः किं तु धूमशिखेत्यसत्यत्वपर्यवसायि[8]वपुःशब्दबलात्प्रतीयते ।

केचित्तु सादृश्यव्यक्तये[9]ऽपह्नववदपह्नवाय सादृश्यमप्यपह्नुत्यलंकारं वदन्ति । यथाहुः -

'सादृश्यव्यक्तये यत्रापह्नवोऽसावपह्नुतिः ।
अपह्नवाय सादृश्यं यत्रास्त्येषा[10]प्यपह्नुतिः ।।' इति ।

---

१- ब्रह्मचर्यः श्रियेव: -क२- इत्यादारोप-क- ३- इत्यतिपामराणां-कग
४- सतु-क,ग, अपह्नवस्तु-ख ५- राद्भावसि भृंग-ख ६- सर्वप् लुष्टः-ख
७- इत्यसत्वाभिधाभि-क ८- --त्यसत्वपर्य--ख,घ-९- व्यक्त येपह्नव-क
१०- यत्रास्तेणाप्य-क

उदाहरन्ति-च-

[१] आकृष्यादावमन्दग्रहमलकचयं वक्त्रमासज्य वक्त्रे
कण्ठे लग्नः सुकण्ठः प्रसरति कुचयोर्दन्त[२]गाढाङ्गसङ्गः ।
बद्धासक्तिर्नितम्बे पतति चरणयोर्यः [३] स तादृक्प्रियो मे
बाले लज्जा निरस्ता न हि न हि सरले चोलकः किं त्रपाकृत् ॥

[४] अत्र विवक्षितं प्रियमपह्नुत्य चोलकत्वारोपः । [५] तदर्थं च प्राक् प्रियचोलसदृशधर्मोपन्यासः । अत्रेदमपह्नुतिकथनं व्याजोक्त्यलंकारं पृथगनङ्गीकुर्वतामुद्भटादीनां मतमनुसृत्य । ये तु उद्भिन्नवस्तुनिगूहनं व्याजोक्तिरिति व्याजोक्त्यलंकारं पृथगिच्छन्ति [६] तेषामिहापि व्याजोक्तिरेव नापह्नुतिरिति रुचकादयः । दण्डी त्वपह्नुतेः साधर्म्यमूलत्वनियममनादृत्य "किञ्चिदपह्नुत्य कस्यचित्प्रदर्शनमात्रमपह्नुतिः" इति लक्षयित्वोदाजहार--

"अपह्नुतिरपह्नुत्य किञ्चिदन्यार्थसूचनम् ।
न पञ्चेषुः स्मरस्तस्य सहस्रं पत्रिणामिति ।।
चन्दनं चन्द्रिका मन्दो [७] गन्धवाहश्च दक्षिणः ।
स्वयमग्निमयी सृष्टिः [८] शीता किल परान्प्रति ।।
अमृतस्यन्दिकिरणश्चन्द्रमा मम नो मतः ।
अन्य एवायमर्कात्मा विषनिष्यन्द[९]दीधितिः ।।"

साधर्म्यमूला त्वपह्नुतिः उपमापह्नुतिरिति [१०] तेन व्याहृता [११] ।

"त्वदालेख्ये कौतूहलतरलतन्वी विरचिते
विधायैका चक्रं रचयति [१२] सुपर्णासुतमपि ।
अथ स्विद्यत्पाणिस्त्वरितमपमृज्यैतदपरा
करे पौष्पं चापं मकरमुपरिष्टाच्च लिखति ।।"

इत्यादावपह्नुतिध्वनिरुदाहर्तव्यः । अत्र हि चक्रसुपर्णलेखनेन नायं साधारणः पुरुषः किं तु पुण्डरीकाक्ष इति कयाचिद्[व्यञ्जि]सूचितम् । अन्यथा तु तस्याप्येतादृशं रूपं न संभवतीत्याशयेन नायं पुण्डरीकाक्षोऽपि किं तु मन्मथ इति तदुभयमुन्मृज्य [१३] पुष्पसायकमकरध्वजलेखनेन व्यञ्जितम् ।।

[१४] इत्यपह्नुतिप्रकरणम् ।

---

७२- --ष्यासावमन्द--क २- दन्तगाढा--घ ३- यः सा-ख, ग, ४- वीक्षितं ग,घ ५- तर्थनद च -ख ६- तेषामपि क-७- मन्दो-क,ख ८- दृष्टिः-ख ९- निष्यन्दि--ख,ग १०- उपमापन्हुतिः इति ख-ग-घपुस्तकेषु नास्ति, ११-व्यवहृता क-ख,ग १२- विपति-ख १३- अपमृज्य-ख,ग १४- चित्रमीमांसायाम् इत्यधिकं ख-गपुस्तकयोः

अथोत्प्रेक्षालंकार:-

यत्रान्यधर्मसंबन्धादन्यत्वेनोपतर्कितम् ।

प्रकृतं हि भवेत्प्राज्ञास्तामुत्प्रेक्षां प्रचक्षते ।।

यथा---

"बालेन्दुवक्राण्यविकाश[१]भावाद्बभु: पलाशान्यतिलोहितानि ।

सद्यो वसन्तेन समागतानां नखक्षतानीव वनस्थलीनाम् ।।"

अत्र प्रकृतानि पलाशकुसुमा[२]न्यप्रकृतनखक्षतधर्मवक्रत्वलौहित्यसंबन्धा-न्नखक्षतत्वेनोपकल्पितानि[३] । तर्क: संभावनामात्रं न त्ववधारणम् । तदीयधर्मो हि तत्तादात्म्यसंभावनामात्रहेतुर्न व्याप्तिपक्षधर्मता[४]वल्लिंगवदवधारणहेतु: । न चात्रेवशब्दस्य सादृश्यपरत्वमित्युपमाशंका कार्या । उपमाया यत्र[५] क्वचित्स्थितेऽपि नखक्षतै: सह वक्तुं शक्यतया वसन्तनायकसमागतवनस्थलीसंबन्धित्व[६]विशेषणकल्पनानपेक्षत्वात् । पलाशमुकुलानां नखक्षततादात्म्यसंभावनायामेव तथाविधविशेषणस्योपयुक्तत्वात् । एवमन्यत्रापि यत्र यत्राप्रकृततादात्म्यसंभावनोपयुक्त[७] विशेषणकल्पना तत्र सर्वत्राप्युत्प्रेक्षावगन्तव्या । यथा---

"उवाह या तनुलता मृणालीरोम*वल्लरीम् ।

पश्चाद्विमुक्तां वैमल्याद्बिम्बितामिव वेणिकाम् ।।"

उपमा यत्र क्वचित्स्थितयापि वेणिकया तु वक्तुं शक्येति तत्रानुपयुक्ता, वैमल्यात्पुरोभागप्रतिबिम्बितत्वरूपविशेषणकल्पना[८] तादात्म्यसंभावनायां[९] । यत्र तु संभावनोपयुक्तविशेषणकल्पनारहितमुपमानं निबध्यते तत्र परमिवशब्द: सादृश्यपर इत्युपमालंकार: । अमुमेव विभागमभिप्रेत्य चक्रवर्तिनोक्तम् "यदायमुपमानांशो लोकत: सिद्धिमृच्छति" इत्यादि । दण्डिनापीवशब्दस्योत्प्रेक्षा व्यंजकत्वमुक्तम्[१०] ।

"मन्ये, शंके, ध्रुवं, प्रायो, नूनमित्येवमादिभि: ।

उत्प्रेक्षा व्यज्यते शब्दैरिवशब्दोऽपि तादृश: ।।" इति ।

अत्रादिशब्देन तर्कयामि[११], संभावयामि[१२], जाने उत्प्रेक्षे, स्यात्, इत्येवमादीनां संग्रह: । अत्र च

---

१- विकास-क,ख,ग २- मुकुलानि-क,ख,ग ३- --नोपलक्षितानि-क,ख,ग
४- धर्मतालिंगवदवधार--क ५- अत्र-ख ६--- सम्बन्धित्व-ख ७- नोपयुविशेषण-ख
८- विशेषणफलकल्पना -क ९- --संभावनायाय-ख १०- युक्तम्-ख,घ
११- संभावयामि-क १२- तर्कयामि-क
* - रोमवल्लरीम्- ध.

"कस्तूरिकामृगाणामण्डाद्गन्धगुणमखिलमादाय ।
यदि पुनरहं विधि: [1]स्यां खलजिह्वायां निवेशयिष्यामि ।।"

"[2]अयमुष्णो भवेद्वन्हिर्यदि शीतं भवेज्जलम् ।
मन्ये [3]दृढव्रतो रामस्तदा स्यादप्यसत्यवाक् ।।"

इत्यादिष्वतिव्याप्तिवारणाय धर्मसंबन्धादित्युक्तम् । तेषु हि "यद्यर्थोक्तौ च कल्पनम्" इत्यतिशयोक्त्यलंकारविषयेषु, संभावनं यदीत्थं स्यादित्यूहोऽन्यस्य सिद्धये" इति संभावनालंकारविषयेषु वा निर्निमित्तमेव तथा तर्कोपतर्कणम् । तथापि----

"सर्वातिशायिसौन्दर्यं [4]शङ्के सत्यवतो मुखम् ।
येन सा मृगशावाक्षी [5]सावित्री तरलीकृता ।।"

इत्यादिष्वतिव्याप्ति: स्यादिति तद्वारणायान्यधर्मसंबन्धादित्युक्तम् । तत्र [6]सावित्रीहृदयतरलीभावकारकत्वादिना स्वधर्मेणैव वितर्कणमिति नातिव्याप्ति: ।

"विरक्तसंध्यापरुषं [7]पुरस्ताद्[8]यतो रज: पार्थिवमुज्जिहीते ।
शङ्के हनूमत्कथितप्रवृत्ति: प्रत्युद्गतो मां भरत: ससैन्य: ।।"

इत्यत्रातिव्याप्तिवारणायान्यत्वेनेति विशेषणम् । तत्र [9]ससैन्ये प्रत्युद्गन्तर्यन्यत्रापि दृष्टस्याग्रे[10]रजोगमनस्य संबन्धेन निमित्तेन भरत: प्रत्युद्गतत्वेन वस्तुसद्रूपेणै[11]वोपतर्कितो न त्वन्यत्वेनेति नातिव्याप्ति: ।

"नरसिंहमहीपाल [12]विद्वस्त्वां मकरध्वजम् ।
मार्गणास्तव संजाता: कथं सुमनसोऽन्यथा ।।"

इत्यत्रातिव्याप्तिवारणायोपतर्कितमित्युक्तम् । तत्रानुमानालंकारविषये सुमनोमार्गणत्वेन मन्मथत्वव्या[13]प्तिलिङ्गेन राज्ञि मन्मथत्वमवधृतं न संभावनामा[14]त्रम् ।

"इन्दुर्लि[15]प्त इवाञ्जनेन ज[16]डिता दृष्टि[17]र्मृगीणामिव
प्रम्लानारुणिमेव विद्रुमलता श्यामेव हेमप्रभा ।
कार्कश्यं कलया च कोकिलवधूकण्ठेष्विव प्रस्तुतं
सीताया: पुरतश्च हन्त शिखिनां बर्हा: सगर्हा इव ।।"

---

१- स्या:-ख २- वायु:-ख ३- दृढव्रतो-ख ४- सौशके-ख ५- गायत्री-ख
६- गायत्रीहृदय-ख ७- --कापिश-क ८- यथा-क,ख,ग ९- ससैन्यं-क
१०- रजोभरोदग्मनस्य-क,ख,ग ११- तर्कितो-क १२- विद्मस्त्वा-क १३- व्याप्त-क १४- मात्रपदम्-क,ख,मात्रपरम्-ग १५- इन्दुलिप्त-ख १६- जसिता-ख
१७- दृष्टी--ख

इत्यत्रातिव्याप्तिवारणाय प्रकृतमित्युक्तम्[१]। तत्र निरतिशयसौन्दर्यसीतावदनादिसंनिधानेन तद्वदनाद्युपमानेष्वपि[२] निकर्षापादकेन प्रशस्तोपमानेष्विन्द्वादिष्वप्रकृतेष्वञ्जनलेपादिनिकर्षसंभावना क्रियत इति नातिव्याप्तिः। नन्वेवमपि---

'अस्मद्विक्रमचेष्टितानि निखिलत्रैलोक्यहेलाजय-
प्रह्वीभूतसुरासुराणि भवती भूमेः सुता शृण्वती।
पत्यौ द्वैणकषायितेन मनसा स्निग्धा मयि स्यास्यति
स्त्रीणां प्रेम यदुत्तरोत्तरगुणग्रामस्पृहाचञ्चलम्॥'

इत्यत्र चाञ्चल्यसहचरितत्वेनान्यत्र दृष्टस्त्रीत्वस्य[३] संबन्धेन निमित्तेन वस्तुतः पत्येकस्थिरचित्ता[४] देवी सीता चञ्चलत्वेनोपतर्किता। न च तत्रोत्प्रेक्षालंकारः। रावणकृततदीप्सितसंघटनानुकूल[५]विचारमात्रस्य निबद्धत्वेन विच्छित्तिविशेषाभावात्। न चान्यधर्मसंबन्धादित्यत्र धर्म उपमायामिव सहृदयहृदयाह्लादी विवक्षितः, न तु साधारणधर्ममात्रम्। तथा च नोक्तातिव्याप्तिः। स्त्रीत्वादेश्चाञ्चल्यादिसंभावनामात्रप्रयोजकत्वेऽपि[६] सहृदयहृदयाह्लादिसाधारणधर्मभावेनोपमालंकारप्रयोजकत्वाभावादिति[७] वाच्यम्। तथापि[८]

'स्तनाभिरामस्तबकां नूनं सीतेति बल्लरीम्।
संभावयन्रघुपतिर्धावति[९] स्म दिदृक्षया॥'

इत्यत्रातिव्याप्तेरवारणात्। न चाहार्यत्वं तर्कविशेषणम्[१०]। इह त्वनाहार्या संभावनेति वाच्यम्। तथा सति 'शङ्के हनूमत्कथितप्रवृत्तिः[११]' इति संभावनाया अप्यनाहार्यत्वेन तद्व्यावृत्त्यर्थस्यान्यत्वेनेत्यस्य वैयर्थ्यप्रसंगादिति चेत्, मैवम्। अन्यत्वेनेत्यस्यान्यत्वेनावगतपरतया तस्यैवाहार्यत्वविशेषणपर्यवसायित्वात्।

ननु तथापि नैतल्लक्षणम्, अव्याप्तेः। तथा हि यत्र स्वमात्रधर्मादन्यमात्रधर्माद्वा किञ्चिदुत्प्रेक्ष्यते तत्रान्यधर्मसंबन्धादिति लक्षणांशाभावादव्याप्तिः[१२]। यथा---

'अंगुलीभिरिव केशसञ्चयं संनियम्य[१३] तिमिरं मरीचिभिः।
कुड्मलीकृतसरोजलोचनं चुम्बतीव रजनीमुखं शशी॥'

---

१- उपतर्कितम्-ख घ, २- दृशुपमानान्तरेष्वपि-क,ख ३- दृष्टस्यस्त्रीत्वस्य-ख
४- प्रत्येकस्थिरचित्ता-घ ५- संघटनानु-ग ६- संभावनप्रयोजक-ख ७- साधारणधर्माविभावेनोत्प्रेक्षालंकार-क ८- तथासति क,घ ९- संभावयन् घुपति--ख १०- तर्क विशेषणम्-क,ख ११- हनुमत्-ख १२- भावादित्यव्याप्तिः-ख १३- संनिगृह्य-क,ग

'भूयस्तराणि मदमूनि तमस्विनीषु

ज्योत्स्नीषु[1] च प्रविरलानि ततः प्रतीमः ।

संध्यानलेन भृशमम्बरमूषिकाया-

मावर्तितैरुडुभिरेव कृतोऽयमिन्दुः ॥'

इत्यत्राद्योदाहरणे[2]ऽलीसदृशीभिर्मरीचिभिः केशसंचयसदृशस्य तिमिरस्य ग्रहणात्स्वमात्रधर्मादेव शशिनश्चुम्बनमुत्प्रेक्षितम् । द्वितीये ताराविरलत्वाविरलत्वरूपेणान्यमात्रधर्मेण चन्द्रस्य संध्यानलमध्यगाम्बर[3]मूषिकावर्तिततारानिकरनिर्मितत्वमुत्प्रेक्षितम्[4] । किं च हेतुफलधर्मस्वरूपोत्प्रेक्षास्वन्यत्वेनेति लक्षणांशाभावादव्याप्तिः[5] । यथा---

'सैषा स्थली यत्र विचिन्वता त्वां भ्रष्टं मया नूपुरमेकमुर्व्याम् ।

अदृश्यत त्वच्चरणारविन्दविश्लेषदुःखादिव बद्धमौनम् ॥'

इति हेतूत्प्रेक्षोदाहरणे नूपुरगतेन दुःखिसाधारणेन[6] मौनित्वेन निमित्तेन नूपुरे तद्धेतुभूतदुःखमेव धर्मतयोत्प्रेक्ष्यते, न तु दुःखितादात्म्यम्[7], दुःखशब्दस्योपरि मतुबाद्यश्रवणात्[8] । एवम्---

'चोलस्य यद्भीतिपलायितस्य भालत्वचं कण्टकिनो वनान्ताः ।

अद्यापि किं वानुभविष्यतीति व्यपाटयन्द्रष्टुमिवाक्षराणि[9] ॥'

इति फलोत्प्रेक्षोदाहरणे द्रुमगतेन ललाटाक्षरदर्शनप्रवृत्तपुरुषसाधारणेन ललाटपाटनेन[10] निमित्तेन द्रुमाणां तत्फलं ललाटाक्षरदर्शनमुद्देश्यमिति धर्मतयोत्प्रेक्ष्यते न तु ललाटाक्षरदर्शनप्रवृत्तधर्मितादात्म्यम्, द्रष्टुमित्यस्य[11] धर्मिपर्यन्तत्वाभावात् । तथा[12]---

'पिनष्टीव तरंगाग्रैः समुद्रः फेनचन्दनम् ।

तदादाय करैरिन्दुर्लिम्पतीव दिगंगनाः ॥'

इति धर्मस्वरूपोत्प्रेक्षोदाहरणे समुद्रस्य चन्दनघर्षणशिलाप्रान्तस्थानीये[13] तटे हस्तस्थानीयतरंगाग्रैः फेनचन्दनपेषकत्वेन शशांकस्य करैर्दिगंगनादिधवलीकरणेन च प्रतीयमानेन निमित्तेन तत्कर्तृकं पेषणलेपनमात्रमुत्प्रेक्ष्यते, न तु तयोः पेषणलेपनकर्तृतादात्म्यम् । पिनष्टि लिम्पतीत्याख्यातयोः कर्तृवाचकत्वेऽपि 'भावप्रधानमाख्यातम्' इति न्यायेन कर्तुः प्रधानभूतक्रियोपसर्जनस्यान्यत्रान्वयासंभवात् । अत एव 'लिम्पतीव तमो--

---

१- ज्योत्स्नासु-ख २- इत्यत्राद्योदा-क ३- सज्यानलमध्यमावर(?) ख-
४- --निकरनिर्मितत्वमुत्--क ५- अव्याप्तिः इति क-खयोः नास्ति
६- दुःखसाधा--ख ७- दुःखतादात्म्यम्-ख ८- तुमुबाद्यश्रवणात्-घ
मतुबाद्यश्रयणादेव-ख ९- दृष्टमिवा-ख १०- ललाटनेन-ख ११- दृष्टमित्य-ख
१२- तथापि-क १३- --स्थानीतरंगाग्रैः-ख

ङ्गानि वर्षतीवाञ्जनं नभः" इत्युत्प्रेक्षामुदाहृतवता दण्डिना[1] क्तोदाहरणयो-रिवशब्दश्रवणाल्लेपनवर्षणकर्तृभ्यां तमोनभसोरुपमामाशंक्य

"कर्ता यद्युपमानं स्यान्न्यग्भूतोऽसौ[2] क्रियापदे ।

स्वक्रियासाधने[3] व्यग्रो नालमन्यदपेक्षितुम् ॥"

इति दूषितम् ।

"वृत्तानुपूर्वे च न चातिदीर्घे जङ्घे शुभे सृष्टवतस्तदीये ।

शेषाङ्गनिर्माणविधौ विधातुर्लावण्य उत्पाद्य इवास यत्नः[4] ॥"

इत्यत्र निरतिशयलावण्यशालिजंघासृष्ट्यनुमितेन निःशेषलावण्यकोशक्ष-येन निमित्तेन विधातुः शेषाङ्गनिर्माणे[5]पयुक्तलावण्योत्पादने यत्नमात्रमु-त्प्रेक्ष्यते, न तु तथाभूतयत्नवत्[6]तादात्म्यमिति स्पष्टमेव ।

अपि[7] च[8] अप्रकृतधर्मिकोत्प्रेक्षायां प्रकृतमित्यंशा[9]भावादव्याप्तिः । यथा--

"हृतसारमिवेन्दुमण्डलं दमयन्तीवदनाय[10] वेधसा ।

कृतमध्यबिलं विलोक्यते धृतगम्भीर[11]खनीखनीलिम[12] ॥"

अत्र कृतमध्य[13]बिलमिति पदार्थहेतुककाव्यलिंगापेक्षयातिशयोक्त्या कृ-तमध्यरन्ध्राकाशनैल्यत्वेना[14]ध्यवसितो यः कलंकस्तद्धत्त्वेन निमित्तेन कल-काध्यवसितधृतमध्यरन्ध्राकाशनैल्यत्वनिमित्तोत्प्रेक्षितं[15] कृतमध्यबिलत्वेन नि-मित्तेन वा चन्द्रमण्डलं दमयन्तीवदननिर्माणाय हृतसारत्वेनोत्प्रेक्षितम्, नतु प्रकृतं दमयन्तीवदनमेवोक्तप्रकाराहृतेन्दवसारांशनिर्मितत्वेनोत्प्रेक्षितम् । "यद् बालेन्दुकलोच्चयादुपचितैः सारैरिवोत्पादितं तत्पश्येयमनंगमंगलगृहं भूयो-[16]ऽपि तस्या मुखम् ।" इत्यत्रेव[17] तथाशब्दान्वयाभावात् । ननु यथा शब्दतोऽन्वया-लाभेऽपि "ब्राह्मणशतं भोज्यता"मित्यत्र प्रधानमतिलंघ्यो[18]पसर्जने[19] क्रियान्वयपर्य-वसानम्, संख्याया भोजनान्वयायोग्यत्वात्, तथेहापि प्रधानमिन्दुमण्डल-मतिलंघ्योपसर्जने[20] दमयन्तीवदने[21] इन्दुमण्डलाहृतसारांशनिर्मितत्वोत्प्रेक्षापर्य-वसानं स्यात्, अप्रकृतस्यावर्णनीयत्वादिति चेत्, न । अप्रकृतवर्णनस्याप्य-प्रस्तुतप्रशंसारूपेण प्रकृतातिशयाधानार्थतयान्वेतुं योग्यत्वात् । नच वाच्यं "इन्दुर्लिप्त इव" इत्यप्रस्तुतप्रशंसोदाहरणान्तर[22] इवात्रापि संभावनामात्रमेव

---

१- दण्डिनोदाहरण-क,ख २- न्यग्भूतोसौक्रिया--क ३- -साधनव्यग्रो-क ४- यत्नः-क ५- निर्माणे मात्रमुत्प्रेक्ष्यते-ख ६- यत्नः-ता-ख ७-अपि इति सपुःनास्ति ८- च इति सपुस्तकेनास्ति-९- प्रतमित्यं-ख १०- वदनान्य-ख ११-धृतगम्भीर-ख १२- नीलिमा-ख १३- प्रकृतमध्य-क १४- निल्यत्वेन-ख १५- -चोत्प्रेक्षितमध्यबिलत्वेन-क, --चोत्प्रेक्षितकृतमध्य--ख १६- मुयापि-क १७- इत्यत्रैव-क १८- मितिलंघ्य-ख १९- --लंघ्यनुसर्जनो-ख २०- सर्जने-ख २१- वदनेन्दु-ख,२२-हरणान्त इवा--ख

नोत्प्रेक्षे[1]ति । तत्र सहृदयहृदयाह्लादिनिमित्ताभावेनोत्प्रे[आ]क्षासामग्रीपरिपूर्त्यभा-
वादुत्प्रेक्षाया असंभवेऽप्यत्र तत्संभवादप्रस्तुतप्रशंसया संकरोपपत्तेः । त-
स्मादव्याप्तत्वान्नेदं लक्षणं युक्तमिति चेत् ।-

अत्र ब्रूमः । न तावत् 'हृतसारम्' इत्यादावव्याप्तिः प्रकृतशब्दस्य
विषयत्वाभिमतमात्रपरत्वात् । नचैवं 'इन्दुर्लिप्त इव' इत्यादावतिव्याप्तिः ।
तत्र सीतावदनसंनिधाने वस्तुतोऽन्यधर्मत्वे सत्यपीन्दुगताञ्जनलिप्तत्वसंभाव-
नायामन्यधर्मत्वस्याप्रयोजकत्वात्, धर्मस्य सहृदयहृदयाह्लादिनो विवक्षि-
तत्वाद्वा । अन्यत्वेनेत्यस्यान्येन प्रकारेणेत्यर्थं इति न हेतुफलधर्मस्वरूपोत्प्रे-
क्षास्वव्याप्तिः । यत्र धर्मिणि धर्म्यन्तरं तादात्म्ये[2]नोत्प्रेक्ष्यते तत्र धर्म्यन्त-
रमन्यः प्रकारः । यत्र तु कश्चिद्धर्म एव किंचित्प्रति हेतुतया फलतया
स्वरूपेण चो[3]त्प्रेक्ष्यते तत्र स एव धर्मोऽन्यः प्रकार इति सर्वत्राप्यनुगतेः ।
यद्वा हेतुफलधर्मस्वरूपोत्प्रेक्षोदाहरणेष्वपि तादात्म्येनैवोत्प्रेक्षा । तथा हि ।
'सैषा स्थली यत्र विचिन्वता त्वाम्, 'चोलस्य यद्भीतिपलायितस्य' इत्या-
दिहेतुफलोत्प्रेक्षोदाहरणयोस्तावद्विश्लेषदुःखललाटाक्षरदर्शनादिधर्मो हेतुतया
फलतया[4] वा[5] नोत्प्रेक्ष्यते । किं तु नूपुरमुखादिधर्मिकं यन्निश्चलत्वकण्टक-
संश्लेषादिनिमित्तकं[6] मौनव्यापाटनादिकं तदेव दुःखहेतुकमौनललाटाक्षरदर्श-
नार्थव्यापाटनादितादात्म्येनोत्प्रेक्ष्यते । अवश्यं च द्विविधस्या[7]पि मौनादेस्तादा-
त्म्येनाध्यवसाय आस्थेयः । अन्यथा निश्चलत्वादिहेतुके स्वाभाविकमौनादौ
दुःखादेर्हेतुत्वादिनोत्प्रेक्षणमसमञ्ज[अ]सं स्यात् । अंगीकृतश्च[8] 'सैषा स्थली'
इत्यादौ दुःखादि[9]धर्म एव मौनादिहेतुतया नूपुरादिगतत्वेनोत्प्रेक्ष्यत इति
वदताप्यलंकारसर्वस्वकृता द्विविधस्य मौनादेरभेदाध्यवसायः[10] । हेतूत्प्रेक्षायां
[11] यस्य प्रकृतसंबन्धिनो धर्मस्य हेतुरुत्प्रेक्ष्यते स धर्मोऽध्यवसाय[12]वशादभिन्न
उत्प्रेक्षानिमित्तत्वेनाश्रीयते इत्यादितद्वचनात् । आवश्यकं चान्यत्रापि क्वचि-
त्क्वचिद्धेतूत्प्रेक्षोदाहरणे निमित्तांशे तादात्म्याध्यवसायाश्रयणम् । यथा--

'उन्मेषं यो मम न सहते जातिवैरी निशाया-
मिन्दोरिन्दीवरदलदृशा[13] तस्य सौन्दर्यदर्पः ।

---

१- नोत्प्रेक्षते-ख २- तद्रूपात्म्ये-क ३- वा-क ४- फलतया इति गपुस्तके नास्ति
५- च-ग ६- निमित्तकमौनव्यापा--क-७- द्विवधस्या-क ८- अंगीकृत च-क,ख
९- दुःखादिधर्मो-ख,ग १०---अध्यवसानम्-क ११- यस्य यस्य प्रकृत--ख-
१२- वशात् इत्यारभ्य अध्यवसाय (२४ प०) इत्यन्त खपुस्तकेनास्ति १३- यस्य-ग

नीत: शान्तिं प्रसभमनया वक्त्रकान्त्येति हर्षा-
ल्लग्ना मन्ये ललिततनु ते पादयो: पद्मलक्ष्मी: ।।'

अत्र हेतुतया हर्षोत्प्रेक्षां प्रति तत्फलत्वाभिमतं पादयो: पद्मलक्ष्म्या लगनं निमित्तं वाच्यम्, तच्च सर्वथैवासिद्धम् । अतस्तत्र पादयोर्य: स्वाभाविकशोभासम्बन्ध: स एव पद्मलक्ष्मीलग्नत्वेनाध्यवसितो निमित्तमिति समर्थनीयम् । एवं निमित्तांशे तादात्म्याध्यवसानावश्यंभावे तत्रैवोत्प्रेक्षाविश्रान्तिरस्तु । नच तत्र निमित्तान्तरमन्वेष्यं स्यादिति वाच्यम् । निश्चलत्वहेतुकमौनस्य दु:खहेतुमौनत्वेनोत्प्रेक्षायां चरणारविन्दविश्लेषकालभवत्वं[1] निमित्तं कण्टकसंश्लेषहेतुकव्यापाटनस्य ललाटलिपिदर्शनार्थव्यापाटनत्वेनोत्प्रेक्षायां महाराजोऽप्येवं कष्टमनुभवति, इत: परमपि कियदनुभाव्यमनेनेति जिज्ञासोत्थापकपलायनकालभवत्वमित्यादे: स्पष्टत्वात् ।

अयमेव पक्षो दण्डिनोऽभिमत: । यदाह---

'अन्यथैव स्थिता वृत्तिश्चेतनस्येतरस्य वा ।
अन्यथोत्प्रेक्ष्यते यत्र तामुत्प्रेक्षां प्रचक्षते ।।
मध्यन्दिनार्कसन्तप्त: सरसीं[2] गाहते गज: ।[3]
मन्ये मार्तण्डगृह्याणि[4] पद्मान्युद्धर्तुमुद्यत:[5] ।।
स्नातुं पातुं बिसान्यत्तुं करिणो जलगाहनम् ।
तद्वैरनिष्क्रयायेति कविनोत्प्रेक्ष्य वर्ण्यते ।।' इति ।

अत्र सन्तापनिवृत्त्यर्थत्वेनान्यथैव[6] स्थिता करिणश्चेतनस्य जलगाहनरूपा[7] वृत्तिरन्यथा तद्वैरनिष्क्रयार्थजलावगाहनत्वेनोत्प्रेक्ष्यत इति स्वकृतलक्षणानुसारेणैव योजितम् ।

काव्यप्रकाशिकाकारस्याप्ययमेव पक्षोऽभिमत: । तेन हि 'संभावनमथोत्प्रेक्षा प्रकृतस्य समेन यत्'[8] इत्युपमानोपमेयस्य तादात्म्यसम्भावनमुत्प्रेक्षालक्षणमभिधाय 'उन्मेषं यो मम न सहते' इति तत्रोदाहरणं[9] कृतम् । ततश्च स्वकृतलक्षणानुरोधेन स्वाभाविकी पादशोभैव स्ववैरिजयप्रभवहर्षलग्नपद्मलक्ष्मीत्वेनोत्प्रेक्ष्यत इत्यभिमतमिति स्फुटमेव ।

---

१- कालभवत्वात्-ख २- सरसी-ख ३- जल:-ख ४- मार्ताण्ड-ख ५- सुतसुक:-क, ख,ग ६- अन्यथैव इति क-पुस्तके नास्ति ७- जलावगाहन-क,ख ८- तदात्म्य--क
९- अत्र (?)-क

तथा 'पिनष्टीव तरंगाग्रै:' इत्यादिधर्मस्वरूपोत्प्रेक्षोदाहरणेष्वपि प्रेरणादिरेव पेषणादिरूपत्वेनोत्प्रेक्ष्यते । न च प्रेरणादेर्विषयस्यानुपादानं दोष: । अतिशयोक्ताविव तदुपपत्ते: । उत्प्रेक्षाया अध्यवसायगर्भतया तत्र विषयनिगरणस्योचितत्वाच्च । न च प्रेरणादेर्विषयत्वेन निमित्तत्वाभावे निमित्तान्तरमन्वेष्यं स्यादिति वाच्यम् । प्रेरणस्य पेषणरूपतयोत्प्रेक्षायां प्रान्तगतफेनचन्दनपुंजीभवनं निमित्तम् । करव्यापनस्य दिगंगनालेपनत्वेनोत्प्रेक्षायां तद्धवलीकरणं निमित्तमिति निमित्तान्तरस्य जागरूकत्वात् ।

'लिम्पतीव तमोऽंगानि वर्षतीवाञ्जनं नभ:' इत्यादौ व्यापनादिलेपनादिरूपतया सम्भावितमिति वदता काव्यप्रकाशिकाकारेणापि धर्मस्वरूपोत्प्रेक्षोदाहरणेषु तादात्म्योत्प्रेक्षणपक्ष एवाश्रित: ।

एवं चुम्बतीव रजनीमुखं शशी-त्यादावपि रजन्या बदनत्वेनाध्यवसितं यदारम्भाख्यं मुखं तस्य शशिनश्च सम्बन्धश्चुम्बनत्वेनोत्प्रेक्ष्यते । वृत्तानुपूर्वे च' इत्यत्रायत्नपूर्वके शेषांगनिर्माणे यत्नपूर्वकत्वतादात्म्योत्प्रेक्षेत्याद्यूह्यम् ।

अन्यधर्मोऽनुगामितयैव न विवक्षित:, किं तूपमायां साधारणधर्म इव बिम्बप्रतिबिम्बभावादिभि: सर्वैरपि प्रकारैर्विवक्षित: ।

तथा च यथा--

'आवर्जिता किंचिदिव स्तनाभ्यां वासो[1] वसाना तरुणार्करागम्[2] ।
सुजातपुष्पस्तवकावनम्रा संचारिणी[3] पल्लविता लतेव ।।'

इत्यत्र बिम्बप्रतिबिम्बभावकृताभेदाध्यवसायेन ।

'तारुण्यकुंजरारूढां बिलासकमलाकुलाम् ।
मूर्तामिव मनोजस्य त्रैलोक्यविजय[4]श्रियम् ।।'

इत्यत्र समा[5]सभेदाश्रयणकृताभेदाध्यवसायेन च धर्मस्य प्रकृता[6]प्रकृतसाधारण्यादन्यधर्मसम्बन्ध: । तथा[7]--'अंगुलीमिरिव' इत्यत्रान्वयभेदकृताभेदाध्यवसायेन धर्मस्य प्रकृताप्रकृतसाधारण्यादन्यधर्मसम्बन्ध: सुसंपाद इति न तत्राव्याप्ति: । नापि 'भूयस्ताराणि' इत्यत्राव्याप्ति: । तत्रोपात्तधर्मादि[8]प्तधर्मान्तरसम्बन्धस्य निमित्तत्वात् । तत्र हि चन्द्ररूपविषयगतसंध्यानलमध्यागाम्बरभूषिकावर्तिततारानिकरनिर्मितत्वोत्प्रेक्षायां तारागतेन तच्छात्रिषु विरलत्वाविरलत्वरूपेणोपात्तधर्मेण निमित्तेन धर्मस्य चन्द्रगतस्य तद्विरलत्वाविरलत्वानुविधा[9]यिवृद्धिह्रासशालित्वस्याक्षेप: ।

---

१- 'वासोवसाना' इतिद्विरावृत्तम्-ख २- तरुणार्करागम्-ख ३- संचारिणि -ख
४- विजयम् (श्रियम् इति च नास्ति)-ख ५- समाग(?) समेदाश्रयणकृतभेदा-ख
६- अप्रकृत इति खपुस्तकेनास्ति ७- तथा इत्यारभ्य सबन्ध: (परपंक्तौ)
इत्यन्तं ख पुस्तकेनास्ति ८- धर्मादिाप्त इति ख पुस्तकेनास्ति ९- विधायि
इत्यारभ्य धर्मोत्प्रेक्षासु तु (परपृष्ठायां २य पंक्तौ) इत्यन्तं ख पुस्तकेनास्ति

अयं चापरोऽपि विशेषः । अन्यधर्मसंबन्धादित्यन्यपदार्थो धर्म्युत्प्रेक्षासु विषयुयेव, धर्मोत्प्रेक्षासु तु विषयिणो धर्मस्याश्रयः । एवं स्थिते यत्रानुपात्तो निमित्तभूतो धर्मस्तत्र सर्वत्रापि यो धर्मोऽन्यं-पदार्थस्य विषयस्य च संबन्धितया संभावनापदवीमारोहति तथाभूतोऽन्वेष्यः । तत्र 'वर्षतीवाञ्जनं नभः' इत्यत्र नभोगतत्वेन वर्षणक्रियोत्प्रेक्षापक्षे नभसो भूपर्यन्तगामिनीलिम[1]व्याप्तत्वमञ्जनवर्षं[2]कसाधारणनिमित्तम् । तमसो व्यापने नभःकर्तृकाञ्जनवर्षणक्रियात्वोत्प्रेक्षेति पक्षे तु सकलवस्तुसान्द्रमलिनीकरणादि । एवं 'वेलेव रामसागरस्य' इत्यादौ संक्षोभकारित्वादि गम्यं निमित्तमूहनीयम् । यत्र तु निमित्ततया धर्मस्योपादाने सत्यपि तत्संबन्धो विषयस्यान्यपदार्थस्य वाञ्जसा न प्रतीयते तत्र क्वचिन्निमित्त[3]भूतधर्मादन्यस्य कस्यचिद्धर्मस्य तत्ताद्रूप्य[4]संपादनेन तत्संबन्धः समर्थनीयः । क्वचिद्विषयस्य चा[5]न्यपदार्थस्य वा तद्धर्मा[6]श्रयताद्रूप्यसंपादनेन, क्वचिन्मिलितेन तेनोभयेन, क्वचिदुपात्तधर्मकृतधर्मान्तराक्षे[7]पेण । तत्र धर्मा[8]न्तरस्य निमित्तताद्रूप्यसंपादनमुपमाया धर्मस्य[9] संपादनमिव बिम्बप्रतिबिम्बभावादिभिः प्रकारैस्ते [10]प्रदर्शिताः ।

एवं विषयस्यान्यपदार्थस्य वा धर्माश्रया[11]ताद्रूप्यसंपादनं श्लेषादिभंग्या[12] । त[13]त्र विषयस्य श्लेषेण धर्माश्रयताद्रूप्यसंपादनं यथा---

अस्यां मुनीनामपि मोहमूहे
भृगुर्महान्यत्कुचशैलशीली ।
नाना[14]रदाङ्कादि मुखं श्रितोऽ-
व्यासो महाभारतसर्गयोग्यः ।।

---

८१- निलीम--ख २- वर्षक-ख ३- -दन्यस-ख ४- ताद्रूप्यसंपा--क
५- वान्यपदार्थस्य ग-क ६- वा द्धर्माश्रय--ख ७- -क्षपो (?)-ख
८- धर्मातरस्य-क ९- साधारण्यसंपादनमिव-क,ग १०- च इत्यधिकं
क पुस्तके ११- धर्माश्रयताद्रूप्य-क १२- भंग्यते-ख १३- त्र विषयस्य
(भंग्यते) तेऽत्र--ख १४- नानारथा-ख

अत्र भृग्वादिमुनि[१]रूपविषयगतदमयन्तीगोचरमोहोत्प्रेक्षायां यदेव त-त्वपरिशीलनादि निमित्तं न तद्विषयगतं किं तु तटादिगतम् । तस्य भृग्वादिशब्दश्लेषेण विषयगततानिर्वाहः । अपह्नुत्या यथा--

'किं शुकव्यपदेशेन त[२]रुमारुह्य सर्वतः ।
[३]दग्धादग्धामरण्यानीं पश्यतीव विभावसुः ।।'

अत्र दावानलरूपविषयगतदग्धादग्धवनप्रदेशदर्शनक्रियोत्प्रेक्षायां तरु-समारोहणं निमित्तम् । तदपि न विषयगतं किं तु किंशुकपुष्पगतम् । तत्रापि यद्यपि मुख्यं समारोहणं नास्ति तथापि तदीयं तरुसमाश्रयणमेव तदारोहणत्वेनाध्यवसितम्, ततश्च तत्रापह्नुत्या विषयस्य किंशुकपुष्पताद्रू-प्यसंपादनेन धर्मसंबन्धनिर्वाहः ।

अन्यपदार्थस्य श्लेषेण धर्माश्रयताद्रूप्यसंपादनं यथा--

'अस्या दो[४]हदशालिन्या मुखमापा[५]ण्डुरप्रभम् ।
सत्यं राजेति मन्येऽहं [६]यद्भुवं भोक्तुमिच्छति ।।'

अत्र मुखस्य चन्द्रत्वोत्प्रेक्षायां भुवं भोक्तुमभिलाषो निमित्तम्, तद्विष-यगतमपि नान्यपदार्थभूतचन्द्रगतम् । अतस्तत्र राजशब्दश्लेषेण चन्द्रस्य धर्माश्रयताद्रूप्यसंपादनेन धर्मस्य तदीयता निर्वाहः ।

धर्मान्तरस्य निमित्तधर्मताद्रूप्यसंपादनं विषयस्य तद्धर्माश्रयताद्रूप्यसंपा-दनं चेत्युभयमेलनं यथा--

'आकृष्टिवेगविचलद्भुजगेन्द्रभोग-
निर्मोकपट्टपरिवेष्टनयाम्बु[७]राशेः ।
मन्थव्यथाव्युपशमार्थमिवाशु यस्य
मन्दाकिनी चिरमवेष्टत पादमूले ।।'

अत्र मन्दाकिनीरूपविषयगतपयोधिमन्थव्यथाव्युपशमरूपफलोत्प्रेक्षायां यन्निमित्तं चरणमूले वेष्टनं तत्तादात्म्यसंपादनं प[८]र्यन्तवेष्टनस्य श्लेषेण विषय-यस्य य[९]त्ताद्रूप्यसंपादनमपह्नुत्या वे[१०]ति मिलितेनोभयेन विषयस्यान्यधर्मसंब-

---

१- भृग्वादिमुनिनामपिरूपविषय-ख २--मारुण्य-ख ३- दग्धादग्धामरण्यानां--ख दुग्धादग्धामरण्यानी-घ ४- दोहद-क,ख ५- पाण्डुर-ख ६- यद इति खपुस्तकेनास्ति ७- राशेः-ख [illegible] ८- पर्यन्त इत्यारभ्य संपादनम् (परपंक्तौ) इत्यन्तं खपुस्तकेनास्ति ९- तत्ताद्रू--क १०-वेति -क

न्धनिर्वाहः। उपात्तधर्मेण धर्मान्तराक्षेपस्तु दर्शित[1] एव। तस्मादन्यधर्मसंबन्धादित्येतदपि[2] सर्वोत्प्रेक्षानुगतमिति न काप्यव्याप्तमिति सर्वं समंजसम्।

अलंकारसर्वस्वकृतेत्थमस्य विभागः प्रदर्शितः। वाच्या प्रतीयमाना चेति तावदुत्प्रेक्षा द्विविधा। इवादिप्रयोगे वाच्या, तदप्रयोगे प्रतीयमाना। तत्र वाच्या जातिगुणक्रियाद्रव्याणामप्रकृतानामध्यवसेयत्वेन चतुर्विधा। तेषां च प्रत्येकं भावाभावाभिमानरूपतया द्वैविध्येनाष्टविधा। तेषु निमित्त[3]गुणक्रियारूपत्वेन षोडशभेदाः। निमित्तस्य पुनरुपादानानुपादानाभ्यां द्वात्रिंशत्प्रकाराः। तेषु पुनः प्रत्येकं स्वरूपहेतुफलोत्प्रेक्षारूपत्वेन षण्णवतिर्भेदाः। तत्र द्रव्यस्य स्वरूपोत्प्रेक्षणमेवेति[4] हेतुफलोत्प्रेक्षास्ततोऽपि[5] विघातनीयाः। ततः[6] षोडशभेदा न्यूनाः। जात्यादीनामपि हेतुफलोत्प्रेक्षायोर्निमित्तस्यानुपादानं न संभवति ततश्चतुर्विंशतिर्भेदा न्यूनाः। तथा च स्वरूपोत्प्रेक्षा वैकल्येन द्वात्रिंशद्भेदा, हेतुफलोत्प्रेक्षे प्रत्येकं द्वादशभेदे, इति षट्पंचाशद्भेदा[7] वाच्योत्प्रेक्षा। प्रतीयमानोत्प्रेक्षायामप्येवमेव गणना। तत्र स्वरूपोत्प्रेक्षायामपि निमित्तानुपादानं न संभवतीति भेदः। ततश्च तत्र स्वरूपोत्प्रेक्षा षोडशभेदा, हेतुफलोत्प्रेक्षे पूर्ववद्[8]द्वादशभेदे इति चत्वारिंशद्भेदा गम्योत्प्रेक्षा। एवमेव[8] मिलित्वा षण्णवतिभेदोत्प्रेक्षेति।

विधानार्थेन पुनर्द्रव्यस्य हेतुफलोत्प्रेक्षणमभ्युपगम्यांगीकृत्यानुपात्तनिमित्तेषु गम्यस्य निमित्तस्य गुणक्रियारूपत्वेन भेदगणनमजातपुत्रनामकरणकल्पं[9] न चारुत्वावहमिति तदनादृत्यान्यथा विभागो दर्शितः। वाच्यायां[ां] स्वरूपोत्प्रेक्षा चतुर्विंशतिभेदा, अनुपात्तनिमित्ताया गुणक्रियारूपभेदगणनाभावेन भेदाष्टकह्रासात्। हेतुफलोत्प्रेक्षे प्रत्येकं षोडशविधे। द्रव्योत्प्रेक्षागोचराणां भावाभावाभिमानेन गुणक्रियानिमित्तत्वेन[10] चतुर्णां भेदानामाधिक्यात्। एवं षट्पंचाशद्भेदा वाच्योत्प्रेक्षा। प्रतीयमानायां[11] पुनः स्वरूपोत्प्रेक्षापि षोडशप्रकारा। तत्र निमित्तानुपादानासंभवेन[12] तन्निबन्धन[13]भेदाष्टकह्रासात्। ततश्चाष्टचत्वारिंशद्भेदा प्रतीयमानोत्प्रेक्षा। एवं मिलित्वा चतुरुत्तरशतभेदोत्प्रेक्षेति।

अथोदाहरणानि दिङ्मात्रेण प्रदर्श्यन्ते। उपात्तगुणनिमित्तजातिभावस्वरूपोत्प्रेक्षा यथा --

स वः पायादिन्दुर्नवबिसलताकोटिकुटिलः
स्मरारेर्यो मूर्ध्नि ज्वलनकपिशे भाति निहितः।

---

१-प्रदर्शित-क २- स्तत् इति कपुस्तकेनास्ति ३- निमित्तस्य गुण--क,ख ४- --मेवे हेतु के ५- स्ततोऽतिपातनीयाः-क ६- ततः इत्यारभ्य संभवति (परपंक्तौ) इत्यन्तं खपुस्तके नास्ति ७- पंचपंचाशद्भेदा-घ ८- एवं मिलित्वा-क ९- करणकल्प-ख १०- च इत्यधिकं खपुस्तके ११- प्रतीयमान,या-घ १२- दानसंभवेन-ख १३- निबन्धने- ख

स्रवन्मन्दाकिन्याः प्रतिदिवससिक्तेन पयसा
कपालेनोन्मुक्तः स्फटिकधवलेनाङ्कुर इव ।।'

अत्राङ्कुरशब्दस्य जातिशब्दत्वाज्जातिरुत्प्रेक्ष्यते । उपात्तः कौटिल्यगुणो निमित्तम् । स्वमुपात्तक्रियानिमित्तापि जातिभाव[1]स्वरूपोत्प्रेक्षोदाहर्तव्या । उपात्तक्रियानिमित्तगुणभाव[2]स्वरूपोत्प्रेक्षा यथा---

'निवेशितं यावकरागदीप्तये लग्नं तदीयाधरसीम्नि सिक्थकम्[3] ।
रराज तत्रैव निवस्तुमुत्सुकं मधूनि निर्धूय सुधासधर्मिणि[4] ।।'

अत्रौत्सुक्यं गुण उत्प्रेक्ष्यते । उपात्ता[5] लगनक्रिया[6] निमित्तम् । स्वमुपात्तगुणनिमित्तापि गुणभावस्वरूपोत्प्रेक्षोदाहर्तव्या । उपात्तगुणनिमित्तक्रियाभावस्वरूपोत्प्रेक्षा[7] यथा---

'अथ साध्यसान्द्रकिरणारुणितं[8] हरिहेतिहूति मिथुनं पततोः ।
पृथगुत्पपात विरहार्तिगलद्[9]हृदयस्रुतासृगनुलिप्तमिव ।।'

अत्र रुधिरानुलेपनक्रियोत्प्रेक्ष्यते । उपात्त आरुण्य[10]गुणो निमित्तम् । स्वमुपात्तक्रियानिमित्तापि क्रियाभावस्वरूपोत्प्रेक्षोदाहर्तव्या[11] । उपात्तक्रियानिमित्तद्रव्यभावस्वरूपोत्प्रेक्षा यथा--

'एकैकमुद्धृतगुणं[12] च्युतदूषणं च
हित्वान्यमन्यमुपगम्य परित्यजन्ती[13] ।
एतां जगाद जगदार्चितपादपद्मा
पद्मामिवाच्युतभुजान्तर[14]विच्युता सा[15] ।।'

अत्र पद्माया एकतया द्रव्यत्वाद्द्रव्यमुत्प्रेक्ष्यते । उपात्ता उपगम्यपरित्यजनक्रिया निमित्तम् । स्वमुपात्तगुणनिमित्तद्रव्यभावस्वरूपोत्प्रेक्षोदाहर्तव्या । एवं भावाभिमानेषु[16] जात्यादिषूपात्तनिमित्ता अष्टौ भेदाः संपन्नाः । अनुपात्तनिमित्तजातिभाव[17]स्वरूपोत्प्रेक्षा यथा--

'वर्षातपानावरणं चिराय काष्ठौघमालम्ब्य समुत्थितेषु[18] ।
बालेषु[19] तारकबकेष्विवैकं[20] विकस्वरीभूतमवैमि चन्द्रम् ।।'

अत्र बकजातिरुत्प्रेक्ष्यते । अनुपात्तो धावल्यवर्तुलत्वादिर्गुणो[21] निमित्तम् । अनुपात्तनिमित्तगुणभावस्वरूपोत्प्रेक्षा[22] यथा[23]--

---

१- भावः स्वरूप--क २- गुणस्वरूपोत्प्रेक्षा-क,ख ३-सिष्कक (?)-ख ४-सधर्मिणी-ख
५- उपात्तलगन--क ६- लग्नक्रिया-ख ७- क्रियास्वरूपोत्प्रेक्षा-ख-८- किरणा रुणि--क९- -तिदल-कख,ग १०-आरुण्यगुण निमित्तम्-क ११-उदाहार्या-ख१२-गण-क १३-परित्यजन्ती-क १४-भुजतिर--ख १५-सः-ख १६-भावमिमा--ख १७-जातभाव-घ,
१८- समुत्थितेषु-क,ख १९-नेकेषु-क,वालेषु इति खपुस्तकेनास्ति २०---ष्विवहं-ख
२१-वर्तुलत्वादि निमित्तम्-ख २२- अनुपात्तनिमित्तगुणस्व[illegible]-क, अनुपात्तगुणस्वरू--ख
२३- यथा इति घ पुस्तकेनास्ति

"अयमाभाति राजेन्द्रो विजिताखिलशात्रवः ।

अनुजीविषु सर्वेषु प्रसाद इव मूर्तिमान् ।।"

अत्र प्रसादो गुण उत्प्रेक्ष्यते । अनुपात्तो बहुप्रदत्वसुखनिर्णेव्यत्वादि[1]-र्निमित्तम् । अनुपात्तनिमित्तक्रियाभावोत्प्रेक्षा यथा--

"लिम्पतीव तमोऽङ्गानि वर्षतीवाञ्जनं नभः ।

असत्पुरुषसेवेव दृष्टिर्निष्फलतां गता ।।"

अत्र क्रियोत्प्रेक्ष्यते । अनुपात्तं[2] व्यापनादि निमित्तम् । अनुपात्तनि[3]-मित्तद्रव्यभावोत्प्रेक्षा यथा--

देहस्था दर्पणे यस्य पश्यति प्रतिमासुमा ।

अन्यार्धाभ्यामिवोत्पन्नमर्धनारीश्वरान्तरम् ।।"

अत्रार्धान्तरोत्पन्नार्धनारीश्वरान्तरद्रव्यमुत्प्रेक्ष्यते[4] । प्रतिबिम्बव्यत्यस्तमा[5]-गस्त्रीपुरुषाकारशालित्वमनुपात्तं निमित्तम् । अर्धनारीश्वरान्तरोत्प्रेक्षायामपि वस्तुतोऽर्धनारीश्वरस्यैकत्वाद्द्रव्योत्प्रेक्षात्वमविरुद्धम् । यथा वा--

"विललास जलाशयोदरे क्वचन द्यौरनुबिम्बितेव[6] या ।

परिखा[7] कपटस्फुटस्फुरत्प्रतिबिम्बानवलम्बिताम्बुनि[8] ।।

अत्र देवपुरीद्रव्यमुत्प्रेक्ष्यते । सौभाग्यातिशयः कुण्डिनपुरीगतोऽनुपात्तो निमित्तम् । एवं चतुर्विधानुपात्तनिमित्तोदाहृता । अस्यां निमित्तस्य गुण-क्रियारूपभेदमालोच्याष्टविधत्वमूहनीयम्[9] । एवं जात्याद्युत्प्रेक्षा भावाभिमानवत्यः षोडश संपन्नाः ।

अथ वा विधानाथोक्तप्रकारेणानुपात्तनिमित्तगुणक्रियाभेदो न चिन्तनीयः । अनुपात्ते निमित्ते तद्व्यवस्थाया असंभवात्[10] । यथा--"विललास जलाशयोदरे" इत्यत्र निरतिशयसौभाग्यवत्त्वं गुणो निमित्तमित्यपि वक्तुं शक्यम् । निरतिशयसौभाग्यभागित्वं[11] क्रियानिमित्तमित्यपि । अतो द्वादशैव भेदाः । अथाभावाभिमानवत्यः स्वरूपोत्प्रेक्षाः ।

उपात्तगुणनिमित्तजातिगुणक्रियाणामभावोत्प्रेक्षा यथा--

"अकुंकुमदानमिवाङ्गमेतदयावकारुण्यमिवाधरं ते ।

अनञ्जनोल्लेखमिवादियुग्मं स्वाभाविकैरेव गुणैरुदीक्षो ।।

---

१- त्वादिनिमित्तम् । -ख- निर्णेव्यत्वादिर्निमित्तक्रियाभावोत्प्रेक्षा, यथा घ
२- अनुपात्त-ख ३- अनुपात्तद्रव्य--ख ४- रोतपन्ना अर्ध--ख ५- प्रतिबिंबगत
बिवत्यस्त क (?) ख ६-- म्बितेव-क ७- परिखादुस्फुट--ख ८- अम्बुनि:(?)
ख-९- ष्टविधमहनीयम्-क १०- असंभवा-ख ११- सौभाग्यमागित्वक्रिया--क

अत्र कुंकुमरजोयावकरागाञ्जनोल्लेखनरूपाणां जातिगुणक्रियाणामभावा[1] उत्प्रेक्ष्यन्ते। उपात्ताः स्वाभाविकगौरारुणनीलवर्णा निमित्तम्। एतासु क्रियानिमित्तमप्युदाहार्यम्। उपात्तक्रियानिमित्तद्रव्याभावोत्प्रेक्षा यथा--

"भुवि त्वन्मुखमालोक्य पूर्णचन्द्रमिवोदितम्।
अचन्द्रामिव[2] पश्यामि दिवं शोभाविवर्जनात्॥"

अत्र चन्द्रस्य द्रव्यस्याभाव उत्प्रेक्ष्यते। उपात्ता वर्जनक्रिया निमित्तम्। एवमुपात्तगुणनिमित्तापि द्रव्याभावोत्प्रेक्षोदाहार्या। एतावेव श्लोकौ "इदं विशालादि विभावयामि" "पदवीममृतान्धसाम्" इति चतुर्थपादयोः पाठेऽनुपात्तनिमित्तजात्यागुणाभावोत्प्रेक्षोदाहरणे[3]। एवमभावाभिमानवत्योऽपि स्वरूपोत्प्रेक्षाः पूर्वोक्तरीत्या षोडश द्वादश वेति द्वात्रिंशच्चतुर्विंशतिर्वा स्वरूपोत्प्रेक्षाभेदाः प्रदर्शितप्रायाः[4]।

एतासु विषयिणः क्वचित्तादात्म्येनाध्यवसायः। यथा--"स वः पायादिन्दुः[5]" इत्यत्र। क्वचित् संसर्गितया यथा--"निवेशितं यावकरागदीप्तये" इत्यत्रौत्सुक्यस्येत्ययमपि भेदो बोद्धव्यः।

अथ हेतूत्प्रेक्षा। उपात्तगुणनिमित्ता जातिहेतूत्प्रेक्षा यथा--

"तनुरेणशावकदृशस्तनीयसी[6] शनकैरवाप शरकाण्डपाण्डुताम्।
उदरान्तरस्थितिमुपेयुषो हरेः करपाञ्चजन्यकिरणैरिवोद्गतैः॥"

अत्र किरणजातिः पाण्डिमानं प्रति हेतुत्वेनोत्प्रेक्ष्यते। स एव पाण्डिमा निमित्तम्। एवं क्रियानिमित्तापि जातिहेतूत्प्रेक्षोहनीया[7]। क्रियानिमित्ता गुणहेतूत्प्रेक्षा यथा--

"वहतो बहुशैवलक्ष्मतां[8] धृतरुद्राक्षमधुव्रतं खगः।
स नलस्य करं ययौ[9] पुनः सरसः कोकनदभ्रमादिव॥"

अत्र नलकरप्राप्तिक्रियां प्रति कोकनदभ्रमो हेतुत्वेनोत्प्रेक्ष्यते। सैव प्राप्तिक्रिया निमित्तम्। उत्तरत्रापि हेतूत्प्रेक्षायां सर्वत्र फलमेव निमित्तम्। एवं गुणनिमित्तापि गुणहेतूत्प्रेक्षा द्रष्टव्या। गुणनिमित्ता क्रियाहेतूत्प्रेक्षा यथा--

"विस्वता[10] नायिकतेव मित्राः स्वगोसहस्रेण समं जनानाम्।
गावो[11]ऽपि नेत्रापरनामधेयास्तेनेदमान्ध्यं खलु नान्धकारैः॥"

---

१-अभावा इति खपुस्तकेनास्ति २- चन्द्रामिव-ख ३- प्रेक्षाणामुदाहरणे-क, प्रेक्षामुदाहरणे-ख ४- दर्शितप्रायाः-क ५- पायादित्यत्र-क६- तनुरेणुशावक--क ७- ऊहनीयाः-ख ८- बहुशवलता-घ ९- ययौ करं-क १०- विवत्वता ऽनायिकतेव-ग ११- गावोऽपि-ख

अत्रान्ध्यगुणं प्रति[1] नयन[2]क्रिया हेतुत्वेनोत्प्रेक्ष्यते । एवं क्रियानिमित्तापि क्रियाहेतूत्प्रेक्षोदाहार्या । क्रियानिमित्ता द्रव्यहेतूत्प्रेक्षा यथा---

'हृदयं परिपूतमेव नित्यं विदुषस्तस्य विशुद्धकर्मभाजः ।
वियदा[3]पगयेव विश्वमूर्तेः प्रवहन्त्या वसतोऽन्तरंघ्रिपद्मात् ।।'

अत्र पवनक्रियां प्रति गंगाद्रव्यं हेतुत्वेनोत्प्रेक्ष्यते । एवं गुणनिमित्तापि हेतूत्प्रेक्षोदाहार्या । इत्थं भावाभिमानवत्यो हेतूत्प्रेक्षा उदाहृताः[4] ।

अथाभावाभिमानवत्यः ।

'रात्रौ रवेर्दिवा चेन्दोरभावादिव स प्रभुः ।
भूमौ प्रतापयशसी सृष्टवान्सततो[5]ऽस्थिते ।।'
'तस्मिन्नस्तंगते भानौ विधुस्त[6]स्य पदे कियान् ।
इत्यनादरतो नूनं मीलत्यम्बु[7]रुहाकरः ।।
वीणावादनसंरम्भाच्चकम्पे दक्षिणः स्तनः ।
अदृष्ट्वेवेतरं तस्यास्तम्भाभोग[8]तिरोहितम् ।।'

अत्राद्यश्लोके रविचन्द्रयोर्जातिद्रव्ययोरभावौ हेतुत्वेनोत्प्रेक्ष्येते । द्वितीयतृतीयश्लोकयोरादरदर्शनयोर्गुणक्रिययोरभावौ । सृष्टिमीलनकम्पक्रि[9]यास्तु निमित्तानि । एवं गुणनिमित्ता अप्यभावहेतूत्प्रेक्षा उदाहार्याः । एवं षोडशभेदा हेतूत्प्रेक्षा दर्शिता ।

अथ फलोत्प्रेक्षा-

'सौधेषु यत्र सुलभासु[10] मृगेक्षणानां
ज्योत्स्नापहासचतुरासु विसृत्वरीषु ।
चन्द्रस्तदर्थमिव रात्रिषु बंभ्रमीति
कुर्वन्करप्रसरणान्यधिजालवर्गम्[11] ।।'
तव निर्वर्ण्यं[12] यद्वर्णं स्वर्णं वर्णाय तादृशे ।
त्वत्कोशगेहान्निर्गम्य तीर्थेषु[13] वसति ध्रुवम् ।।'
'रथस्थितानां परिवर्तनाय पुरातनानामिव वाहनानाम् ।
उत्पत्तिभूमौ तुरगोत्तमानां दिशि प्रतस्थे रविरुत्तरस्याम् ।।'

---

१- गवानयनक्रिया-क,ख,ग २- क्रिया इत्यारभ्य उत्प्रेक्ष्यते (५ प०) इत्यन्तं खपुस्तकेनास्ति ३- विपदापगयेव-क (?) घ- ४- उदाहृत-ख ५- सततादिते-ग ६- स्तस्यास्त ७- मीलन्त्यम्बु-क ८- स्तम्बाभाग--क,ख, ९- मीलनकक्रिया-ख १०- सुखभासु-क ११- वर्गम्: (?) ख- १२- निर्वर्ण-क,ख १३- तिर्थेषु-ख

'दुग्धार्णवसहायाय कैलासाचलकोटये ।
नूनं प्रतापरूद्रेण यशो दिक्षु प्रसारितम् ।।'

एषु श्लोकेषु क्रमेण मुखप्रभागौरवर्णपरिवर्तनदुग्धार्णवकैलासरूपाणि जातिगुणक्रियाद्रव्याणि फलत्वेनोत्प्रेक्ष्यन्ते । भ्रमणतीर्थवासप्रस्थानप्रसारणक्रिया निमित्तानि । एवं गुणनिमित्ता अप्युदाहार्या: ।

अभावाभिमानवत्य: फलोत्प्रेक्षा यथा--

'त्वदाननेन सादृश्यं प्राप्तुकामो निशाकर: ।
कलंकपंकाभावाय नूनं मज्जति[1] सागरे ।।'

'अरण्यवासा[2]ज्जिर्तबान्धवासु मृगीष्ववै[3]रार्थमिवाशरण्या: ।
कलिन्द[4]देशेश्वरवैरिनार्य: पराङ्मुखा लोचनविभ्रमेषु ।।'

'हैमाद्रिकूलेषु विहारभाज: सिद्धांगनाकल्पितचन्द्रकाथान् ।
श्रीवीररुद्रस्य यशोविलासान्गायन्त्य[5]संस्पृष्ट[6]मिवान्धकारम् ।।'

'वीररुद्रनरेन्द्रस्य जयप्रस्थानसंभवम् ।
रज: पिहितदिग्गो[7]लं निराकाशमिवोत्थितम् ।।'

एषु श्लोकेषु पंकवैरस्पर्शनाकाशा[8]नामभावा: फलत्वेनोत्प्रेक्ष्यन्ते । तेषु[9] पराङ्मुखत्वमेको गुण: । अन्या: क्रिया: । इत्थं गुणक्रियानिमित्तभेदा उदाहार्या: । एवं फलोत्प्रेक्षा: षोडश दर्शिता: । इति वाच्योत्प्रेक्षावर्ग: ।

अथ गम्योत्प्रेक्षा[10] दिङ्मात्रेणोदाह्रियते--

'नभसि महसां ध्वान्तध्वांक्षप्रमापणपत्रिणा-
मिह विहरणै: श्येनंपाता रवेरवलोकयन्[11] ।
शशविशसनत्रासादाशाम्भाच्चरमां शशी
तदधिगमनाचारापारावतैरुदडीयत ।।'

अत्र सूर्येण विसृष्टानां ध्वान्तकाकप्रमापणश्येनरूपाणां किरणानां विहरणेन निमित्तेन सूर्यस्य श्येनपात[12]वती मृगयाविहारक्रियोत्प्रेक्ष्यत इति क्रियास्वरूपोत्प्रेक्षा तावदेका । तस्माच्छशिनस्त्रास: तस्य दिगन्तरगमनं[13] प्रति हेतुत्वेनोत्प्रेक्ष्यत इति हेतूत्प्रेक्षान्या । ततस्तदधिगमस्तारा[14]पारावतानां मुग्धत्वेनाध्यवसितं[15] तत्तत्स्थाने[16]ऽस्फुरणं प्रति हेतुत्वेनोत्प्रेक्ष्यत इत्यपरा च हेतूत्प्रेक्षा । सर्वाश्चैता गम्या: । इवाद्यभावात् । एवमन्या अपि स्वयमेव

---

१- मति सागरे-ख २- वासाज्जित--ख,ग,घ ३- वैरार्थमिवाशरण्य:-क, 'रार्थ' इत्यारभ्य सिद्धांगना (११ पंक्तौ) इत्यन्त ख पुस्तकेनास्ति ४- कलिंग--क ५- गायन्त्यर्य-ख ६- स्पृष्टमिवान्धकारम्-ख ७- दिगालान्निराकाशमिवाथितं-ख ८- -नाकाशनां भाव:-ख ९- मज्जनादयो निमित्तानि इत्यधिकं क-खयो: १०- गम्योत्प्रेक्षा:-ख,ग घ-११- अवलोकयत्-क १२- श्येनपातवती-घ १३- दिगन्तरगमनं-क १४- स्तदवगमन--क,ख १५- मुग्धत्वेनाध्यवसित:-ग,घ १६- ततत्स्थाने-क ततृस्थाने-ख ॐ- स्निग्धा...घ·

बोध्या: । नूनमादिशब्दविरहेण पूर्वोक्तप्रकाराणामुन्नेतुं शक्यत्वात् । प्राग्[१]-दाहृतानामेव श्लोकानां नूनमादिशब्दाविधानेन गम्योत्प्रेक्षोदाहरणत्वसंभवाच्च गम्योत्प्रेक्षा: पृथक्साकल्येन[२] नोदाहृता: ।

इदं तु चिन्त्यते । गम्योत्प्रेक्षासु जातिद्रव्यस्वरूपोत्प्रेक्षे[३] संभवतो नवेति । संभवत इति पक्षे ---

'रुचयोऽस्तमितस्य भास्वत:[४] स्खलिता यत्र निराश्रया:[५] खलु ।
अनुसायमभुविलेपनापणकाश्मीरजपण्य[६]वीथय: ।।'

'परिखावलयच्छलेन या न परेषां ग्रहणस्य गोचर: ।
फणिभाषितभाष्यफक्किका विषमा कुण्डलनामवापिता ।।'

इत्यादिनोदाहरणेन भाव्यम् । अभिमतं[७] च तथा केषांचित् । अलंकारसर्वस्वकारस्य तु न संभवत[८] इति पक्ष: । एतदभिप्रायेणैव तेनोक्तं 'गम्योत्प्रेक्षाविभागे प्रायश्चात्र स्वरूपोत्प्रेक्षा न संभवति' इति । कस्तर्ह्ययं नयोस्तस्य पक्षोऽलंकार:[९] रूपकमेव । अत एव---

'पीयूषप्रसृतिर्नवा[१०] मखभुजां[११] दात्रं तमोलूतये
स्वर्गंगाविमनस्कको कवदनस्त्रस्ता[१२] मृडालीलता[१३] ।
छिन्नार्वि: स्मरकार्मुकस्य किमपि प्राणेश्वरी सागसामाशातन्तुरुदञ्चति प्रतिपदि प्रालेयभानोस्तनु:[१४] ।।'

इत्यत्र मालारूपकमुदाहरता 'स्वर्गंगा विमनस्का' इत्यादिष्वपि रूपकमेवो[१५]ररीकृतम् । तस्माज्जातिद्रव्योत्प्रेक्षे परिहृत्यैव गम्योत्प्रेक्षावर्ग: परिगणनीय: ।

इदं चान्यद्बोद्धव्यम् । धर्म्युत्प्रेक्षासु विषयिविषयानुगतो धर्मो धर्मोत्प्रेक्षासु विषयाश्रय[१६]विषयानुगतो धर्मश्च निमित्तम् । तेन 'उवाह या तनुलता' इत्यादौ वैमल्यं निमित्तमित्यादिपक्षो न युक्त: । तस्य तादात्म्यसंभावनोपयुक्तप्रतिबिम्बघटकस्य तद्धर्मस्य[१७] विषयधर्मत्वाभावात् । 'यत्रान्यधर्मसं[१८]बन्धात्' इत्यादिलक्षणं वदद्भि: सर्वैरपि विषयधर्मस्यैव निमित्तत्वस्य[१९] व्यवहृतत्वादित्यलमतिविस्तरेण । अत्र ब्रूम:-

---

१- प्रायश: इत्यधिकं क-खयो: २- साकाल्येन-ख ३- स्वरूपो--ख ४- स्वभावत:(?) क, भावत:-ख ५- निराश्रय: ख ६- काश्मीराजलपण्य--क,७- अभिमान च-ख ८- भक्त-क ९- पक्षोऽलंकार:-ख १०- प्रसृतिर्न वा-घ ११-मखभुजा-ख १२- वदनस्ता-ख १३- मृणालीलता-क,ख,ग १४- प्रागेयाभावोस्तनु:-ख १५-रूपकत्वमेवो--क १६- विषयस्याश्रय-क १७- तनुगतो धर्मश्च निमित्तं (?) धर्मस्यविषयाङ्गत्(?) वाभावात् गतो धर्मश्च निमित्त-ख १८- यत्रोक्त्य-ख १९- निमित्तस्य त्वं-ख

'विषयिण उत्प्रेक्षायां जातिगुणाधात्मना विभागविधा[1] ।
यादृशी नैव शोभा तयोपमायामिवोपमेयस्य ।।
तदभावे[2]ऽलंकारा: संभवमात्रेण न विभागम् ।
अर्हन्तीतरथास्या विषयो[3]ऽप्येवं विभक्तव्य[4]: ।।
धर्मस्यापि[5] विभागो गुणक्रियात्मा न[6] चारुताहेतु: ।
उपमायामिव सोऽपि न्यूनस्तदभावयो[7]संकलनात् ।।
मनसि सन्तमिव प्रियमीक्षितुं नयनयो: स्पृहयान्तरुपेतयो: ।
ग्रहणशक्तिरभूदिदमीययोरपि न संमुखवास्तुनि वस्तुनि[8] ।।
वतंस[9]नीलाम्बुरुहेण किं दृशा विलोक्यमाने विमनी[10]बभूवतु[11]: ।
अपि श्रुती दर्शनसक्तचेतसा[12] न तेन ते शुश्रुवतुर्मृगीदृशाम्[13] ।।
इत्यादिषु[14] पश्यामो गुणक्रियाभावयोरपि व्यक्तम् ।
उज्ज्वलभावनिबन्धनमुत्प्रेक्षायां निमित्तत्वम् ।।'
अत्र द्वयार्थे उदाहरणे नयनयोर्हृदयगतप्रियवीक्षणायान्त:प्रविष्टत्वो-[15]
त्प्रेक्षणायां[16] वाह्यवस्तुग्रहणशक्त्यभावो[17] निमित्तम् । द्वितीये श्रोत्रेन्द्रियगत-[18]
विलोकनैकाग्रत्वोत्प्रेक्षायां श्रवणक्रियाभावो निमित्तम् । एवम्--
'वीरासनैर्ध्याननिषुणामृषीणाममी समध्यासितवेदिमध्या[19]: ।
निवातनिष्कम्पतया विभान्ति योगाधिरूढा[20] इव शाखिनोऽपि ।।'
इत्यादीन्यभावनिमित्तत्वे भूयांस्युदाहरणानि ।
'अपि च समुच्चयभेद: परिगणनीयो निमित्तेषु[21] ।
भावौ भावाभावौ समुच्चितावपि निमित्ततां भजत[22]: ।।'
'अवैमि[23] हंसावलयो वलक्षास्त्वत्कीर्तिमूर्तेश्चपला[24]: पुलाका: ।
उड्डीय[25] युक्तं पतिता: श्रवन्तीवेशन्तपूरं परित: प्लवन्ते ।।'
'उडुपरिषद्[26]: किं नार्हन्ती निश[27]: किमनौचिती[28]
पतिरिह[29] न यद्दृष्टस्ताभ्यां[30] गणीयसां[31] गण: ।।
स्फुटमुडुपतेराश्मं[32] वक्ष: स्फुर[33]न्मलिनात्मन-[34]
श्छविमदनयो[35]र्विच्छेदेऽपि द्रुतं बत न द्रुतम् ।।

-------------------------------------------

१- विभागविध -क २- तुदभावोऽलंकारा:-क३-द्विषयो,-क४-विभक्तय:-ख५-धर्मस्यापि विभापि विभागो-ख ६- न इति खपुस्तकेनास्ति ७-संकलना-ख८-संमुखवस्तुवस्तुनि-ख ६-वतंश-ख १०-विमली--क ११-बभूवभू:-ख १२-चेतसा-ख१३-सु-स्नुवतुमृगी-ख१४-इति-क १५-अंत:प्र--प्रेक्षणायां द्विरावृत्तम्-ख १६---प्रेक्षायां-क १७-युक्तभावो-ख१८---न्द्रियागत-ख१६-वेदिवध:-ख-२६--रूढ-ख २१-निमुक्तउ (?)भावोभावोभावौ--ख २२-भजत:-क २३-अभैमिह्वा मिह्सावलक्ष स्त्वतकीतिपूर्चपला :पूलाका:-ख२४-पूर्च:-क २५-उड्डीय-श्रवन्तीवे द्विरावृन्त्य वेशन्तीवेशन्ते--खपुस्तके २६-उपड (?)परि-ख २७-निशा-क, निश-ख २८-कीमनौ--ख २६-पतिरिह-ख३०-दृष्टाताभ्यां-ख३१-गणीयस्योगण:-क,ख ३२-रावक्ष:-ख ३३-स्फार-ख३४- आत्मनो-क ३५- पदनयो--क, लविपद (?)-ख

"स्वभावादिषु बह्वीषु निह्नोतुं केन शक्यते ।
मुञ्चितनिमित्तत्वमुत्प्रेक्षासु[1] निरीक्षितम्[2] ॥"

आद्ये[3] उदाहरणे हंसावलीनां कीर्तिपुलाकत्वोत्प्रेक्षायां[4] धावल्यगुणो जलोपरि प्लवनक्रिया चेत्युभयं[5] निमित्तम् । द्वितीये उडुपतिवदासोऽश्मविकारत्वोत्प्रेक्षायामश्मत्वविरूपो[6] भावो द्रुतत्वाभावश्चेत्युभयं निमित्तम् । किं च -

"उत्प्रेक्षायां निमित्तत्वं यज्जातिद्रव्ययोरपि[7] ।
तेनापि[8] विकलां विद्मो[9] निमित्तगणनामिमाम् ॥"

"द्रोणः स तत्र वितरिष्यति भाग्यलभ्य-[10]
सौभाग्यकार्मणमयीं पदवीं गिरिस्ते ।
तद्दीपदीप[11] इव दीप्तिभिरोषधीनां
चूडामिलज्जलदकज्जलदर्शनीयः ॥"

अत्र[12] द्रोणाचलस्य[13] दीपत्वोत्प्रेक्षायां तत्प्रौढौषधिवृक्षदीपस्योपरि[14] स्थितं[15] जलदकज्जलं[16] च निमित्तमिति जाते[17]र्निमित्तत्वं दृष्टम्[18] ।

"निशासु मूर्ध्नि स्फुरता यत्सौधो राजतीन्दुना ।
श्रीकण्ठो भवतरक्षार्थं संनिधानं भजन्निव ॥"

इत्यत्र बाणासुरसौधस्य शिवरूपोत्प्रेक्षायां मूर्ध्नि स्फुरन्निन्दुर्निमित्तम् । एवम्-"भास्वतालंकारेण, श्वेतरोचिषा स्मितेन, लोहितेनाधरेण, सौम्येन दर्शनेन, गुरुणा नितम्बेन, सितेन हारेण, शनैश्चरेण पादेन, विकचेन लोचनोत्पलेन, त्रिभुवनविजयकेतुना[19] रूपेण, ग्रहमयीवे" त्यत्र वासवदत्तायाः सकलग्रहमयत्वोत्प्रेक्षायां श्लेषेण[20] तद्ग्रहरूपापन्नालंकारादयो निमित्तमिति जातिक्रियागुणानां समुच्चितानां निमित्तत्वं दृष्टम् । न चोदाहृतेषु दीप्त्यादिसंबन्धो निमित्तं[21] स[22] च सर्वो गुण एवेति वाच्यम् । तथा सति "ईदृक्षां क्षामतां[23] गतौ[24]" इत्यादावपि गमनादिक्रियासंबन्ध एव निमित्तमिति क्रियाया एव[25] निमित्तत्वप्रसंगात्[26] । न च तथापि "भास्वतालंकारेण[27]" इत्यादौ श्लेषेण सूर्यरूपतापन्ना अलंकारादयो निमित्तं न त्वविशिष्टा[28] जातिर्द्रव्यं वेति वाच्यम् । तथासति "कपालोन्मुक्तः स्फटिकधवलेनांकुर इव" इत्यादावपि कपालोन्मुक्तांकुरत्वा[29]दिविशिष्टमेवोत्प्रेक्षणीयं न त्वविशिष्टं[30] जात्यादि-

---

१- उत्प्रेक्षाया-क,ख २- नीरीक्षितम्-क,ख ३- आद्ये-ख ४- प्रेक्षाया-क ५- उभया-ख ६- प्रेक्षाया-ख ७- अपि: (?) -ख ८- द्वितीय: इत्यधिकं सपुस्तके ९- विघ्नो-घ १०- लभ्य इति सपुस्तकेनास्ति ११--दिप-ख १२- इत्यत्र-ख १३- द्रोणचलस्य-ख १४- वृक्षदोप्तय-क,ख १५- स्थित-ख १६- कजल-ख १७- जातनिमि--ख १८- द्रष्टव्यम्-क १९- विजयिकेतुना-क,ख २०- श्लेषो-क २१- निमित्तत्व (?)-क २२- स इति कपुस्तकेनास्ति, २३- क्षामाता-ख २४- गतावित्यादवपि-ख २५- अपि-क ख २६- अनिमित्तत्वप्रसंगात्-क,ख २७- भस्वता-ख २८- त्वविशिष्टजातिद्रव्य--ख २९- कपालान्मुक्त-ख ३०- त्वविशिष्टजात्यादि--क

कमिति विषयिणोऽपि जात्यादिरूपेण विभागस्यासामंजस्यप्रसंगात् । तस्माद्वि-षयिण इव निमित्तस्यापि जात्यादिरूपेण चतुर्विधतया पुन: प्रत्येकं भावाभावा[1]-भ्यामष्टविधतया च विभाग: कर्तव्य इति[2] न्यून एवायं विभाग: । किं च यद्धे-तूत्प्रेक्षायामनुपादानं निमित्तस्य क्वापि न संभव[3] इति प्रतिश्रुतं[4] तदपि नो चारु ।

'मग्ना सुधायां किमु तन्मुखेन्दोर्लग्ना स्थिता तत्कुचयो: किमन्त: ।
चिरेण तन्मध्यममुंचतास्य[5] दृष्टि: कृशीय: स्खलनाद्भियान्नु ।।'

'इह हेतावुत्प्रेक्ष्ये मज्जनलगने निमित्तमनुपात्तम् ।
तत्कार्यं दृष्टिगतं चिरेण यन्मुखकुचत्यजनम्[6] ।।'

स्यादेतत् । इह मज्जनलगनोत्प्रेक्षयोश्चिरेण मुखकुचत्यागावनुपात्तौ[7] निमित्ते[8] तयोश्च न मज्जनलगने[9] हेतुत्वयोग्ये[10] इति । सत्यम् । तथापि हेतू-[11]त्प्रेक्षैव[12] । न हि हेतुभवनक्षमस्योत्प्रेक्षैव हेतूत्प्रेक्षा, किं तु हेतुत्वेनोत्प्रेक्षा । यथा--'सैषा स्थली यत्र विचिन्वता त्वाम्' इत्यत्र । अत्र हि पंचमी हेतु-त्वप्रतिपादिका । तथा ---

'कपोलफलकावस्या: कष्टं भूत्वा तथाविधौ ।
अपश्यन्ताविवान्योन्यमीदृक्षां क्षामतां गतौ ।।'

इत्यत्र क्षामतागमनं प्रति परस्परादर्शनस्य हेतुत्वोत्प्रेक्षायां शतृप्रत्ययो हेतुत्वप्रतिपादक: ।

'मदनतापभरेण[13] विदीर्य[14] नो यदुदपाति हृदा दमनस्वसु:[15] ।
निबिडपीनकुचद्वययन्त्रणा तमपराधमधात्प्रतिबध्नती ।।'

इत्यत्र हृदयस्य मदनतापेन स्फुटितत्वोत्पतनाभावे[16] कुचद्वययंत्रणाया हेतुत्वोत्प्रेक्षायामुत्पतनप्रतिबन्धकत्वपर:[17] प्रतिबध्नतीशब्द: फलतोऽनुत्पतन-हेतुत्वप्रतिपादक:[18] । एतादृशेषु च फलस्य निमित्तस्योपादानं[19] नियतमेव । अन्यथा पंचम्यादीनामन्वयसंघटनाभावात्[20] । यत्र[21] हेतुत्वप्रतिपादक: शब्दो नास्ति तत्र हेतुभवनक्षमस्यापि स्वरूपोत्प्रेक्षैव ।

अत एवालंकारसर्वस्वकृता-

'प्राप्याभिषेकमेतस्मिन्प्रतितिष्ठासति[22] क्षिणाम् ।
चकम्पे[23] लोक्यमानार्थमय[24]विह्वलितेव भू: ।।'

---

१- भावाभावाभिमानाभ्याम्-क,ख २- 'इति' इति ख पुस्तके नास्ति ३- संभवति-क,ख ४- प्रश्ने -ख ५- ममुञ्चतास्य-ग ६- जात्याजनजात्याजन-ख ७- --त्यागं अनु--ख ८- न इति कपुस्तके नास्ति ९- गणो-ख १०- योगे-ख ११- नेते इत्यधिकं खपुस्तके किञ्च हेतु इत्यारभ्य पंचमी (१२ प०) इत्यन्तं खपुस्तके नास्ति १२- हेतुतुप्रेक्षे-क १३- हरण-ख १४- विदार्य-ख १५- दमन: स्वसु:-ख १६- पातनाभावे-क १७-बन्धकत्व -ख १८- पतनहेतुत्वनहेतुत्वप्रतिपादक:-ख १९- -स्यापा-ख २०-पंचम्यादीनामन्व्य २१- ननु इत्यधिकं कपुस्तके २२- षेकमेतास्मिन्-ख २३- चकचकपे-ख २४- लोक्यमानार्थां-ख

इत्यत्र विच्छलितत्वस्योत्प्रेक्ष्यस्य हेतुत्वप्रतिपादकशब्दरहितस्य कम्पं प्रति हेतुभवनक्षमत्वेऽपि स्वरूपोत्प्रेक्षादाक्षृतेति चेत् । नैवम् ।

एवं हि--

'स्मरसि स्मर मेखलागुणैरुत गोत्रस्खलितेषु[1] बन्धनम् ।
च्युतकेसरदूषितेक्षणान्यवतंसोत्पलताडनानि च ।।'

इत्यत्र हेतूत्प्रेक्षा लक्ष्या[2] न स्यात् । स्मरणगतहेतुत्वप्रतिपादकशब्दाभावात् । न चेष्टापत्तिः ।

'कृतवानसि विप्रियं न मे प्रतिकूलं[3] न च ते मया कृतम् ।
किमकारणमेव दर्शनं विलपन्त्यै[4] रतये[5] न दीयते ।।'

[6] इत्युक्त्यनन्तरं प्रवृत्तस्यास्य श्लोकस्य, अथ[7] वा[8] मत्पूर्वकृतापराधस्मरणेनैव दर्शनं न दीयते किमिति हेतूत्प्रेक्षापरत्व एव सामञ्जस्यात् । यदि तु[9] हेतुत्वप्रतिपादकशब्दाभावेऽपि पूर्वापरानुगुण्येनापि हेतूत्प्रेक्षा भवेत् तर्हीहापि[10] तृतीयोत्प्रेक्षासमभिव्याहारात्तस्याः चिरेण मध्यत्यजने[11] शब्दोपात्ते स्खलनभय-स्यैवाद्योत्प्रेक्षयोरपि[12] निमित्ततया गम्यमाने चिरान्मुखकुचत्यजने मज्जनस्य लग्नस्य च हेतुत्वेनोत्प्रेक्षणमित्येव युक्तम् । यत्रापि हि फले फलत्वप्रतिपादक-शब्दस्तत्राप्यौचित्येन[13] फलोत्प्रेक्षामवधीर्य हेतूत्प्रेक्षाङ्गीकार्या[14] दृश्यते । यथा--

'हृत्तस्य[15] यन्मन्त्रयते[16] रहस्त्वां[17] तदुक्तमामंत्रयते मुखं यत् ।
तद्वैरिपुष्पायुधमित्रचन्द्रसख्यौचिती सा खलु तन्मुखस्य ।।'

अत्र हि हृदयकृतरहस्यमंत्रणोद्भेदनप्रत्यवमर्शकेन[18] तच्छब्देन सख्यौचितीशब्दस्य कमर्थिकष्यन्तस्य सामानाधिकरण्याच्छब्दतो रहस्योद्भेदनस्य मुखगतहृदयवैरिमन्मथसुहृच्चन्द्रसख्यकार्यत्वं प्रतीयते । तथापि तत्र सख्यस्य[19] रहस्योद्भेदनं प्रति हेतुत्वेनैवोत्प्रेक्षा, न तु रहस्योद्भेदनस्य[20] सख्यफलत्वेन । रहस्योद्भेदनं[21] फलमुद्दिश्य सख्यं कृतमित्युत्प्रेक्षाया[22] असामञ्जस्यात्[23] । हेतुत्वमात्रेण हेतूत्प्रेक्षाया इव तदुद्देशं विना कार्यत्वमात्रेण फलोत्प्रेक्षाया अनिर्वाहात् । एवं यत्र हेतौ हेतुत्वप्रतिपादकः शब्दस्तत्रापि क्वचिदौचित्येन हेतूत्प्रेक्षामवधीर्य[24] फलोत्प्रेक्षाङ्गीकार्या दृश्यते । यथा --

---

१- स्खलनेषु-क,ख,ग २- लक्ष्या इति क-खयोः नास्ति ३- प्रतिकूलेन-ख किंच 'न' इति नास्ति ४- विलपन्त्यो-घ गपुस्तके तु नास्ति ५- रयते घ, गपुस्तके तु नास्ति ६- इति पूर्वश्लोकेन किमित्यकारणमेव दर्शनं न दीयते इत्यधिकं क पुस्तके, ७- अथा-ख ८- वा, इति खपुस्तकेनास्ति ९- तत्र क खपुस्तके तु नास्ति १०- तर्हि ति पुस्तके नास्ति- भवेदेक्यापि तृतीयो--ख- ११- मध्येत्यजने-ख १२- स्येवाद्यो-क १३- स्तत्राथौचित्येन-क १४- अंगीकार्यदिश्यते-ख १५- हृतेस्य-ख १६- यत् इति खपुस्तके नास्ति १७- रहस्याव्यक्त-ख १८- प्रत्यक्ष इत्यारभ्य दृभेदन (प्रत्यक्तो) इत्यन्तं खपुस्तके नास्ति १९- सख्येस्य-ख २०- हरस्योद्भदनस्य -घ २१- रहस्योद्भदनं -क २२- इति इति खपुस्तकेनास्ति २३- असामंजस्य इत्यारभ्य --प्रेक्षाया (परे प०) खपुस्तकेनास्ति २४- -मवधार्य-क

'स्माराशुगीभूय विदर्भसुभ्रूवदा[1] यददाोमि खलु प्रसूनैः ।
स्रजं सृजन्त्या तदशो[2]थि[3] तेषु यत्रैकया सूचिशिखां निखाय ।।'

अत्र निखनने पूर्वकालत्वरूपकारणत्वप्रतिपादकक्त्वाप्रत्ययसद्[4]भावेऽपि[5] न तद्वैरशोधनं प्रति हेतुत्वेनोत्प्रेक्ष्यं किं तु वैरशोधनार्थं निखननमिति वैरशोधनमेव फलत्वेनोत्प्रेक्ष्यम् । सिद्धासिद्ध[6]योरसिद्धस्योत्प्रेक्षणीयत्वात्[7] । इह तदुद्देश्योत्प्रेक्षणसंभवाच्च । यथा वा---

'अस्यैव सर्गाय भवत्कर[8]स्य सरोजसृष्टिर्मम[9] हस्तलेखः ।
इत्याह धाता हरिणेक्षणायां किं हस्तलेखीकृतया तयास्याम् ।।'

अत्र हस्तलेखीकृतया सरोजसृष्ट्येति करणविभक्तिसद्भावेऽपि न सा विधातृकर्तृकसरोजसृष्टिगतहस्तलेखत्वप्रकाशनं प्रति हेतुत्वेनोत्प्रेक्ष्यते[10], किं तु तत्प्रकाशनार्थं सरोजसृष्टि[11]हस्तलेखकरणमिति तत्प्रकाशनमेव फलत्वेनोत्प्रेक्ष्यम् । किं बहुना यत्र हेतुत्वप्रतिपादकः शब्दस्तस्यैव फलत्वमौचित्येन क्वचिदंगीकार्यं दृश्यते । यथा--

'स्तनावालोक्य तन्वंग्याः शिरः कम्पयते युवा ।
तयोरन्तरनिर्मग्नां[12] दृष्टिमुत्पाटयन्निव ।।'

अत्र शत्रु[13]हेतौ विधानेऽपि फलस्या[14]प्युद्देश्यतया कथंचिद्धेतुत्वमित्युपपाद्य फलोत्प्रेक्षांगीकरणीया । एवं च फलत्वादिप्रतिपादनमप्यनादृत्य हेतूत्प्रेक्षादिकमौचित्येनांगीकार्यं तदा किमु वक्तव्यं विरोधिशब्दाभावे औचित्यानुसरणं[15] कार्यमिति । एवमनया दिशान्यत्रापि निमित्तानुपादानं संभवदूहनीयम् । अपि च ---

'यथोपात्तनिमित्तत्वमनुपात्तनिमित्तता ।
प्रत्येकं वर्तते तद्वत्समुच्चित्यापि दृश्यते ।।'

यथा--

'मुनिद्रुमः कोरकितोऽसितद्युतिर्वनेऽमुनामन्यत सिंहिकासुतः ।
तमिस्रपक्षत्रुटिकूटभक्षितं कलाकलापं किल वैधवं वमन् ।।'

अत्र कोरकनिर्गमनविशिष्टस्य मुनिद्रुमस्य विधुकलाकलापवमनविशि[16]ष्ट-

---

१--कुसुमे यद--ख २- तदशोभि-घ ३- केषु ख ४- त्वाप्रत्यय--ख ५- अपि इति कपुस्तकेनास्ति ६- सिद्धासिद्धयोरपि सिद्धस्या--घ ७- प्रेक्ष्यत्वात्-क ८- रसोज--ख-९- ममु-ख १०- हेतुत्वेनोत्प्रेक्षा-क,ख ११- सरोजसृष्टेहस्त--क सरोजसृष्टोहस्त ख १२- तयोरन्तरनिर्मग्ना-क, तयोरंतरनिर्मदग्ना-ख १३- सतुहेतौ-ख १४- फलत्वस्याप्यु--क, फलस्या--ख १५- औचित्यानुशरण-घ १६- कलापवनविशिष्ट--ख

राद्रूपत्वे उत्प्रेक्ष्यमाणे विशिष्योत्प्रेक्षा निमित्तमसितवर्णत्वमुपात्तम् वि-शेषणोत्प्रेक्षा निमित्तं तु कोरकविधुकलासाधर्म्या[1]दिरूपं नोपात्तम् । यथा वा--

"त्वत्प्रा[म]णे सुन्दर पाण्ड्यदेव मतङ्गजाः शृंखलिनो विभान्ति[2] ।
आवासदानादरिभूपतीनामाशान्तशैला इव सापराधाः ।।"

अत्र विशेषणभूतसापराधत्वोत्प्रेक्षा निमित्तं शृंखलितत्वमुपात्तम्, विशे-ष्यशैल[3]रूपत्वोत्प्रेक्षा निमित्तमौन्नत्यादिकं नोपात्तम् । यथा वा--

"अजस्रभूमीतटकुट्टनोत्थितैरुपास्यमानं चरणेषु रेणुभिः ।
रयप्रकर्षाध्ययनार्थमागतैर्जनस्य चेतोभिरिवाणिमाङ्कितैः ।।"

अत्र विशेष्यभूतचेतोरूपत्वोत्प्रेक्षायामणिमाङ्कितैरिति निमित्तमुपात्तम् । अध्ययनार्थमागतैरिति त[त्]द्विशेषणोत्प्रेक्षायामपि चरणोपासनारूपं निमित्तमु[4]-पात्तम् । रयप्रकर्षेत्यध्ययनविशेषणे[5] निमित्तं चेतसां वर्णनीयादश्वादपकृ-ष्टरयत्वं नोपात्तम् । एवमन्यत्रापि निमित्तोपादानानुपादानसमुच्चये उदाहर्त-[6]व्यम् । तस्मान्न्यून: सतृणाभ्यवहारश्चायं विभागः । अतोऽत्र विषयिणो जात्यादिरूपेणाष्टधा विभागम्, धर्मस्य गुणक्रियारूपेण विभागं चापहाय वि-भागान्तरलभ्या यावन्तो भेदास्तावन्त एव चमत्कारिण[7]: ।

[8]स्वरूपहेतुफलोत्प्रेक्षासु तु विधान्तरेणाप्यवान्तरभेदाः संभवन्ति । यथा-- स्वरूपोत्प्रेक्षा द्विविधा, अविशिष्टोत्प्रेक्षा विशिष्टोत्प्रेक्षा[9] च । यत्र विषयिणो विशेषणमुपात्तमपि नोत्प्रेक्षणीयमवगम्यते तद्विषयरूपस्य तन्निमित्तरूपस्य वा विषयविशेषणस्याभावात् किं तु तद्विशेषणं विषयिणि विधान्तरेणोपयुज्यते सा[10] अविशिष्टोत्प्रेक्षा । यत्र तु विषयिणो विशेषणमप्युत्प्रेक्षणीयमवगम्यते तद्वि-षयरूपस्य तन्निमित्तरूपस्य वा विषयविशेषणस्योपादानात्सा विशिष्टोत्प्रेक्षा ।

तत्राद्या यथा--

"रतेर्गृहीतानुनयेन कामं प्रत्यर्पितस्वाङ्गमिवेश्वरेण[11] ।
काकुत्स्थमालोकयतां नृपाणां[12] मनो बभूवेन्दुमतीनिराशम्[13] ।।"

अत्र मदनरूपत्वोत्प्रेक्षायां मदनाकृतिशालित्वमस्ति निमित्तम् । अत-स्तावदुत्प्रेक्षणीयमवगम्यते[14] तत्प्रत्यर्पणं रत्यनुनयप्रसन्नेन परमेश्वरेण कृत-मिति विशेषणांशस्तु[15] नोत्प्रेक्षणीयोऽवगम्यते । तदंशे विषयस्य वाच्यस्य[16]

---

१- साधस्यादि--ख २- विभाति-ख ३- शैरूपत्वो--ख ४६-- सनात्मनिमित्तं-क
५- विशेषणे तु-ख ६- उदाहर्तव्य:-क, ख ७- चमत्कारकारिण:-क, चमत्कारि-ख ८०किञ्च--णीयमवगम्य--विशेषणस्य इत्यधोलिखितः ख अंश: अत्र सन्निविष्ट:
८- स्वरूप इत्यारभ्य उत्प्रेक्षा इत्यन्तं (पदपंक्तौ) खपुस्तकेनास्ति ९- विशिष्टो इत्यारभ्य विशेषणस्य (१६ पंक्तौ) इत्यन्तं खपुस्तकेनास्ति १०- सा विशिष्टोत्प्रेक्षा-
११- निदेश्व--ख १२- नृणां-ख १३- बभुवन्दुमती--ख १४- प्रेक्षणीयमवगम्य-ख
१५- तद्विशेषणांशस्तु-क,ख १६- विषयस्य च वाच्यस्य-ख ।

गम्यस्य वा निमित्तस्य [redacted] वा अलाभात्[1] । किं तु परमेश्वरदग्धस्य मदनदेहस्यासुरदग्धस्य कचदेहस्य शुक्र इव न कश्चिदन्य:[2] प्रत्यर्पणं कर्तुं शक्नोतीति विषयिणि प्रत्यर्पणोपपादकतया तद्विशेषणमुपयुज्यते इत्यविशिष्टोत्प्रेक्षेयम्[3] ।

विशिष्टोत्प्रेक्षायां "मुनिद्रुम:[4] कोरकितोऽसितद्युति:" "त्वत्प्राङ्गणे सुन्दर पाण्ड्यदेव" इत्याद्युदाहरणे विषयोपादानाद्विषयिविशेषणस्योत्प्रेक्षा तावगम्यते । द्वितीये निमित्तोपादानाद्धेतुफलोत्प्रेक्षा त्वसिद्धयो: सिद्धयोर्वा हेतुफलभावेनोत्प्रेक्षणीयतया प्रत्येकं द्विविधे । "सैषा[5] स्थली यत्र विचिन्वता त्वाम्" "चोलस्य यद्भीतिपलायितस्य" इत्यादिषु नूपुरकण्टकिद्रुमादावसिद्धयोर्विश्लेषद्व: खललाटलिपिदर्शनादिकयो[6]र्हेतुफलभावेनो[7]त्प्रेक्षणीयता ।

"आलोहितलतलावेतौ क्षितौ विक्षेपणादिव ।
वर्णयेम कथं तन्व्या: पादौ पल्लवकोमलौ[8] ।।"

"पूरं विधुर्वर्धयितुं पयोधे: शङ्केऽयमेणाङ्कमणि[9]: कियन्ति ।
पयांसि दोग्धि प्रियविप्रयोगात्सशोककोकीनयने[10] क्रियन्ति ।।"

इत्यादिषु पादचन्द्रादौ स्वत:सिद्धयोरेव विक्षेपपयो[11]वर्धनादिकयोर्हेतुफल[12]भावेनोत्प्रेक्षणीयता । प्रकारान्तरेणापि कतिचिदस्या[13] भेदान्[14]समासोक्तिप्रकरणे दर्शयिष्याम:[15] ।

यत्तु[16] सर्वस्वकृता वैचित्र्यान्तर[17]मस्या दर्शितम् । सा क्वचिद्धर्मविषये श्लिष्टा, क्वचिच्छलादिशब्देन[18] सापह्नवा, क्वचित्पदार्थान्वयवेलायां[19] सादृश्याभिधानादुपमाक्रान्ताप्युपमावाक्यार्थतात्पर्यसामर्थ्यादभिमातृ[20]व्यापारौचित्यक्र[21]मेणोत्प्रेक्षायां पर्यवस्यतीत्युपमोपक्रमा चेति । तत्र धर्मविषये श्लिष्टत्वं किमित्युपन्यस्तम् । किं धर्मस्य निमित्तानुगामितयैव श्लेषेणापि निर्वाह्यत इति, किं वा धर्मांशेषु[22] शुद्धतेव श्लेषेणालंकृतापि[23] दृश्यत इति । आद्ये उपमायां साधारणधर्मस्यानुगामित्वादयो यावन्तो भेदा: साधारण्यनिर्वाह[24]कास्ते सर्वेऽप्युत्प्रेक्षायां धर्मस्य निमित्ततानिर्वाहका: संभवन्तीति न्यूनो विभाग: । तथा हि "बालेन्दुवक्राण्यविकाशभावात्" इत्यादौ तावदनुगामित्वं स्पष्टम् । तथा---

---

१- चाभावात्-ख, वालाभात्-घ २- किश्चिदन्य:-क, कश्चिदन्या-ख ३- विशिष्टोत्प्रेक्षोपम् इति खपुस्तकेनास्ति ४- द्रुमि:-ख ५- सौण-ख ६- दिकयोर्हेतु--ख ७-- फलाभावेन ख, घ ८- पादककोमलौ-ख ९- शकेयवेमपिा:-ख १०- सशोकशोणी-ख ११-पयोधिवर्द्धना--ख १२- फलाभावेम-ख,घ १३- अस्य-ख १४- भेदुनु-ख १५- दर्शयिष्यामा:-ख १६- यान्तु-ख १७- वैचित्र्यन्तर-ख १८- क्वचित् इति कपुस्तकेनास्ति १९- क्वचिल(?) तादिश--ख १९- वेलाया-ख २०-अभिमन्तु--क,ख २१--रौह्कि---ख २२- धमांशि-क,ख २३- अलंकृततापि-ख २४- साधारणर्णिवा--ख ।

'व्याराजत सखे तन्व्या[1] वक्त्रं वलितकन्धरम् ।
लावण्यौघजलावृत्त[2]नालदण्डमिवाम्बुजम् ॥'

इत्यत्र वस्तुप्रतिवस्तुभावः । बिम्बप्रतिबिम्बभावादयस्तु प्रागेवोदाहृताः । द्वितीये निमित्तांशेन[3] श्लेषेणैवालंकारान्तरेणा[4]प्यलंकृतता दृश्यते इति न्यूनो विभागः । तथा हि 'अंगुलीभिरिव केशसंचयम्' इति निमित्तांशे उपमालंकारः स्पष्टः ।

'उदरं परिमिति मुष्टिना कुतुकी[5] कोऽपि दमस्वसुः[6] किल[7] ।
धृततच्चतुरंगुलीव यद्वलिभिर्भाति सहेमकाञ्चिभिः ॥'

इत्यत्रोत्प्रेक्षा । अत्र दमयन्त्युदरस्य केनचित्कुतुकिना परिमीयमाणत्वो-[8]त्प्रेक्षायां काञ्चीसहितासु वलीषु तदीयांगुलित्वोत्प्रेक्षा लब्धमुदरगतं च तदीयांगुलि[9]चतुष्टयधारणं निमित्तम् ।

'अजस्रमारोहसि दूरदीर्घां[10] संकल्पसोपानततिं तदीयाम् ।
श्वासान्स वर्षत्यधिकं पुनर्यद्ध्यानादिव[11] त्वन्मयतामवाप्य ॥'

इत्यत्रासंगतिः[12] । यतोऽत्र नलस्य दमयन्तीरूपतावाप्त्युत्प्रेक्षायां दमयन्तीकर्तृकेण सोपानारोहणेन नलस्य श्वासवर्षणं निमित्तम् ।

'प्रतीपभूपैरिव[13] किं ततो भिया विरुद्धधर्मैरपि भेत्तृतोज्झिता ।
अमित्रजिन्मित्रजिदोजसा स यद्विचारदृक्चारदृगप्यवर्तत[14] ॥'

इत्यत्र विरोधाभासः । अत्र हि विरुद्धधर्मगतस्याश्रय[15]भेदकत्वत्यागोत्प्रेक्षायां विरुद्धतयावभासमानधर्माणां नले सहवासो निमित्तम् ।

'ध्रुवमधीतवतीयमधीरतां[16] दयितदूतपतङ्गगतिवेगतः[17] ।
धृतिविरोधकरीं कृशोदरी तदुदितः स हि यो यदनन्तरः[18] ॥'

इत्यत्रार्थान्तरन्यासः । यद्यप्यत्र दमयन्तीगतस्य चापलस्य नलदूतहंसपक्षावेगो हेतुत्वेनोत्प्रेक्ष्यते, तथापि तत्रोत्प्रेक्षायामध्ययनफलमात्रं[19] न निमित्तं किं त्वन्यवेगात्कथमन्यत्र चापलमिति शंकावारणाय निबद्धेन 'तदुदितः स हि यो यदनन्तरः' इत्यर्थान्तरन्यासेनोपस्कृतम् । एवम्---

'गौरीव पत्या सुभगा कदाचित्कर्त्रीयमप्यर्धतनूसमस्याम् ।
इतीव मध्ये विदधे विधाता रोमावलीमेचकसूत्रमस्याम्[20] ॥'

---

१- तस्या-क २---जमावृत--क ३- निमीत्ता--ख ४- श्लेषेण वालंकारान्तरे--क,घ ५- कुटकी-ख ६- दमस्वसु-ख ७- किमु-क,ख ८- परिमीयणत्वो--क ९- तदगुलि--क १०- दीर्घ-ख ११- ध्यानान्तव-क,ख १२- असंयति:-ख १३- भूपौरिव-ख १४- दृवकार(?)-क १५- -स्वाश्रय (?)-क १६- ध्रुवमधीत--ख १७- गतवेगत:-क १८- हित-ख १९- चापलमात्रं-क, प्रेक्षायां फलमात्रं-ख २०-अस्या-क

इत्यत्र निमित्तांशे रूपकमित्याद्यूहनीयम् । तस्मादुभयथापि तत्र श्लिष्टत्वमात्रकीर्तनं न्यूनमितरेषामप्युपलक्षणं द्रष्टव्यम् ।

यत्तु सापह्नवत्वे[1]---

'गतासु तीरं तिमिघट्टनेन ससंभ्रमं पौरविलासिनीषु ।
यत्रोल्लसत्फेनलवच्छलेन[2] मुक्ताट्टहासेव विभाति शिप्रा[3] ।।'

इति[4] स्वरूपोत्प्रेक्षायामुदाहृतं तदपि हेतुफलोत्प्रेक्षयोरपि सापन्हवत्वे उपलक्षणं बोद्धव्यम् । तत्र सापह्नवहेतूत्प्रेक्षायाम् ---

'मुग्धः स मोहात्सुभगा[5]न्निदेहाद्ददद्भवभ्रूरचनाय चापम् ।
भ्रूभंगजेयस्तव[6] यन्मनोभूरनेन रूपेण यदा तदासीत् ।।'

अत्र मदनगते मुग्धशब्दवाच्यत्वे वस्तुतोहेतोः[7] सौन्दर्यस्य[8] हेतुत्वमपन्हुत्य नलभ्रूरचनाय स्वचापादानप्रयुक्तस्य मौढ्यस्य हेतुत्वमुत्प्रेक्षितम् । सापन्हवफलोत्प्रेक्षा यथा--

'रवितप्तो गजः पद्मांस्तद्दुःख्यान्वाधितुं ध्रुवम् ।
सरो विशति न स्नातुं गजस्नानं हि निष्फलम् ।।'

अत्र गजस्य सरः प्रवेशं प्रति वस्तुतः फलस्य स्नानस्य फलत्वमपन्हुत्य पद्मबाधनमत्र[9] फलत्वेनोत्प्रेक्षितम् । न च स्वरूपोत्प्रेक्षायां[10] वास्तवविषयस्वरूपापन्हव एव विच्छित्तिविशेषो[11] न तु हेतुफलोत्प्रेक्षयोः[12] प्रसिद्धहेतुफला[13]पन्हव इत्यस्ति । प्रत्युतोदाहृतयोर्हेतुफलोत्प्रेक्षयोः सिद्धहेतुफलापन्हवोऽपि सहेतुकः न तूदाहृतविषयः[14] स्वरूपापन्हववत्[15] निर्हेतुक इत्यत्रैव चमत्कारातिशयसत्त्वात् । तस्मादिमे अपि सापन्हवोत्प्रेक्षे इत्युपलक्षणतैव युक्ता । अन्य[16]दत्र विचारणीयं समासोक्तिप्रकरणे विचारयिष्यते ।

यत्तु 'कस्तूरीतिलकन्ति[17] भालफलके' इत्यादावुपक्रान्ता उपमा औचित्यादुत्प्रेक्षायां पर्यवस्यतीत्युक्तं तत्र भाला[18]दिस्थानविशेषसंबन्धस्य कस्तूरीतिलकादितादात्म्यमात्रे औचित्यं चेत् रूपके पर्यवसानं[19] स्यादिति तस्य तादात्म्यसंभावनायामौचित्यसुगम्योत्प्रेक्षायां पर्यवसानं वाच्यम् । तथा च--

'रक्षन्तु त्वामसितजलजैरञ्जलिः पादमूले
मीना नाभीसरसि हृदये कौस्तुभाख्या[20] मुरारेः ।

---

१- सापह्नवत्वं-क २- फेनतति--क, यत्रोल्लसत्फेनततिलेन-ख ३- शिप्रा इति खपुस्तके नास्ति ४- इति इति ख पुस्तके नास्ति ५- सुभगाच-क,ख,ग,घ ६- स्तप-ख ७- वस्तुतोऽहेतोः-ग,घ ८- सौन्दर्यहेतुत्व-क ९- बाधनं प्रति-क १०- प्रेक्षायां-क ११-विच्छित्तिविशेषो-क,घ १२- फलोत्प्रेक्षयोः-ख,घ १३- प्रसिद्ध-क १४- तुदाहृत--ख १५- स्वरूपापन्हववत हेतुत्प्रेक्षायां प्रप्रकरत्व, इत्यत्रैव--ख घपुस्तके तु स्वरूपापन्ह-इत्यारम्य सापन्हवोत्प्रेक्षे (परपंक्तौ) इत्यन्तं नास्ति । अपिच तत्र सापन्हवोत्प्रेक्षे इत्यस्य स्वरूपापन्हवोत्प्रेक्षे इति पाठः । १६-अन्यच्चात्र-क,ख १७- तिलक -ख १८- फलादिस्थान-ख १९- अपि इत्यधिकं कपुस्तके २०-मारबाणा -क,ख

हारा: कण्ठे हरिमणिमया[1] बक्रपद्मे[2] द्विरेफा:
पिच्छाचूडा शिखरनिकरे घोषयोषित्कटाक्षा: ।।

इत्यादौ रूपकप्रतीतिस्थलेऽप्युत्प्रेक्षापगन्तव्या । तथा--

पतत्रिणा तद्रुचिरेण वञ्चितं[3] श्रिय: प्रयान्त्या:[4] प्रविहाय पल्वलम् ।
चलत्पदाम्भोरुहनूपुरोपमा चुकूज कूले कलहंसमण्डली ।।

लोकाश्रयो मण्डपमादिसृष्टिर्ब्रह्माण्डभाण्डत्यनुकार्यमस्य[5] ।
स्वकान्तिरेणूत्करवान्तिमन्ति[6] घुणव्रणद्वारनिभानिभानि ।।

अथाजिनाषाढधर:[7] प्रगल्भवाग्ज्वलन्निव[8] ब्रह्ममयेन तेजसा ।
विवेश कश्चिज्जटिलस्तपोवनं शरीरबद्ध:[9] प्रथमाश्रमो[10] यथा ।।

इत्यादावुपमाप्रतीतिस्थले[11] यथोत्प्रेक्षायां पर्यवसानम् । एवम्--

वरण: कनकस्य मानिनी दिवमंकादमराद्रिरागताम् ।
घनरत्नकवाटपक्षति:[12] परिरभ्यानुनयन्नुवास[13] याम् ।।

स्वधाकृतं यत्तनयै: पितृभ्य: श्रद्धापवित्रं तिलमिश्रमम्भ: ।
चन्द्रं पितृस्थानतयोपतस्थे[14][15] तदंकरोचि:[16] खचिता सुधैव ।।

इत्यादिरूपकप्रतीतिस्थलेऽपि तस्यां पर्यवसानमुपगन्तव्यम्[17] । तादात्म्यसंभावनोपयुक्तविशेषणनिबन्धरूपन्यायसाम्यात् । एवम्--

पूर्णेन्दो: परिक्षीणकान्तवपुष:[18] स्फारप्रभाभासुरं
नेदं मण्डलमभ्युपैति गगनाभोगाज्जिगीषोर्जगत् ।
कामस्योच्छ्रितमातपत्रमधुना[19] पाण्डुप्रदोषश्रिया
मानोन्नद्धजनाभिमानदलनोद्योगैकहेवाकिन: ।।

इत्यपन्हुत्युदाहरणे एषापि[20] द्रष्टव्यम् । अधिकं[21] निदर्शनालंकारप्रकरणे चिन्तयिष्यते[22] ।

ननु गम्योत्प्रेक्षाया[23] अलंकारतया परिगणनमयुक्तम्[24] । तस्या अलंकारध्वनित्वात्[25] । उच्यते । विषयविषयिनिमित्तेषूपात्तेषु[26] केवलमिवादिवाचका-

---

१- माणिमाया-ख २- पद्मं-ख ३- वर्जितं-क,ख ४- प्रद्यान्त्या--ख ५- -काद्यमस्य-क
६- अयं श्लोकार्ध: ख-ग-घ-पुस्तकेषु नास्ति ७- अयं श्लोकार्ध: खपुस्तके नास्ति ८- प्रगल्भवागुज्वलनिव-क ६- शरीरवध-ख १०- प्रथमाश्रयो-क ११-इत्यादावुपमा--क
१२- घन-ख १३- -नुनीय-ख १४- पितरस्यातयोप-क १५- पतस्थाने-ख १६- तदंग ग घ
१७- अभ्युपगन्तव्यम्-क १८- परिवेष--क १६- कामस्योर्जित--क २०-अथ इत्युत्प्रेक्षाप्रकरणम् समाप्यप्रथाय सप्तक लभ्यमानोग्रन्थ: । उपमा सदृटोपमेयोपमया 3 थानन्वय: स्मरणम् । रूपकपरिणतिसंशयभ्रान्तिमदुल्लेखनिन्हवोत्प्रेक्षा: ।।इति प्रतिपाद्यालंकारसूची इति ग पुस्तके
२१-शेष-क १२- वक्ष्यते-क २३- प्रेक्षाया:-क २४- गननम्-क २५- उत्प्रेक्षा ध्वनि--क
२६-निमित्तेष्वाप्युपात्तेषु-क

प्रयोगमात्रेण[1] यत्रोत्प्रेक्षावगम्यते[2] सात्यन्तं[3] स्फुटत्वाद्वाच्यायमानत्वादलंकार-[4]
तामेवासादयतीति । यथोदाहृतम् । यत्रोत्प्रेक्षणीयस्य विषयिणोऽप्यनुपादानं[5]
निबद्धेन वस्तुनालंकारेण वा गम्योत्प्रेक्षा, गूढा तत्रैवोत्प्रेक्षाध्वनिः । यथा--

[6]
वीराः भटान्दृष्ट्वा जयलक्ष्म्यावृतान्रणे ।
कर्षन्त्यरिवधूकेशान्कानने कण्टकिद्रुमाः ।।

अत्र वस्तुना कचग्रहणरूपेण[7] जयश्रीसमालिंगितभटदर्शनोद्दीपितमन्युतया[8]
इवेत्युत्प्रेक्षा ध्वन्यते ।

वेलामतिक्रम्य पृथुर्मुखेन्दोरालोकपीयूषरसेन तस्याः ।
नलस्य रागाम्बुनिधौ विवृद्धे तुंगौ कुचावाश्रयति स्म दृष्टिः ।।

अत्रैकदेशविवर्तिरूपके मज्जनभयादिवेत्युत्प्रेक्षावगम्यते । एवमन्यत्रा-
प्युदाहार्यम् ।

इत्युत्प्रेक्षाप्रकरणम्[9] ।

अथातिशयोक्तिः -

तस्यास्तावत्--

विषयस्यानुपादानाद्विषय्युपनिबध्यते ।
यत्र सातिशयोक्तिः स्यात्कविप्रौढोक्तिजीविता ।।

इति लक्षणमुक्त्वा चातुर्विध्यं वर्णयन्ति । भेदेऽभेदः, अभेदे भेदः,
संबन्धेऽसंबन्धः, असंबन्धे संबन्ध इति । एतेषामुदाहरणानि--

कमलमनम्भसि कमले[10] कुवलयमेतानि[11] कनकलतिकायाम् ।
सा च सुकुमारसुभगेत्युत्पातपरम्परा केयम् ।।

अन्येयं रूपसंपत्तिरन्या वैदग्ध्यधोरणी ।
नैषा कमलपत्राक्षी[12] सृष्टिः साधारणी विधेः ।।

अस्याः सर्गविधौ प्रजापतिरभूच्चन्द्रो नु कान्तिप्रदः
श्रृंगारैकरसः स्वयं नु मदनो मासो नु पुष्पाकरः ।

---

१- -मात्रात्-क २- गम्यते-क ३- तत्र इत्यधिकं कपुस्तके ४- वाच्यायमानालंकारता-क
५- अनुपादानात्- क- ६- लक्ष्मीवृतान्-क ७- गुहरूपजयश्री -क८- पृथु-क ९- चित्रमीमांसा-
याम् इत्यधिकं गपुस्तके १०- च इत्यधिकं कपुस्तके ११- कुवलये तानि-क १२- नलिनपत्राक्षी
-क

वेदाभ्यासजड: कथं स विषयव्यावृत्तकौतूहलो
निर्मातुं प्रभवेन्मनोहरमिदं रूपं पुराणो मुनि: ।।

दाहोऽम्भ: प्रसृतिंपच: प्रचयवान्बाष्प: प्रणालोचित:
श्वासा: प्रेङ्खितदीप्तदीपकलिका[1]: पाण्डिम्नि मग्नं वपु: ।
किं चान्यत्कथयामि रात्रिमखिलां त्वन्मार्गवातायने
हस्तच्छत्रनिरुद्धचन्द्रमहसस्तस्या[2]: स्थितिर्वर्तते ।।

अत्र कमलादीनां मुखादिभेदेऽप्यभेद: । रूपादीनां लोकसिद्धरूपाध-भेदेऽपि[3] भेद: । रूपस्य पुराणप्रजापतिसृष्टिसंबन्धेऽप्यसंबन्ध: । विरहादीना-मम्भ: प्रसृतिंपचत्वाद्यसंबन्धेऽपि संबन्धश्च क्रमेण निबद्ध: । अत्रेदं विचार्यते । विषयस्यानुपादानादित्यत्र किमनुपादानं सर्वथैव विषयस्य प्रतिपादकाभाव:, तद्वाचकाभावो वा । आद्ये "कमलमनम्भसि" इत्यादावपि[4] लक्षणं न स्यात् । कमलादिशब्दानां लक्षणया विषयभूतमुखादिप्रतिपादकत्वात् । द्वितीये "चुम्बतीव रजनीमुखं शशी" इत्यादिषु मुखशब्दादिश्लेषमूलातिशयोक्ताव-व्याप्ति: । विषयिवाचकातिरिक्तविषयप्रतिपादकाभावो विवक्षित इति चेत्, तथापि "उन्मीलितानि नेत्राणि पद्मानीवोदिते[5] रवौ" इत्यादावुन्मीलितशब्द-वाच्यलक्ष्यार्थाध्यवसायरूपातिशयोक्ताव्याप्ति[6]: । तत्रोन्मीलितशब्दस्य विषयीभूतविकाशलक्षकतया तद्वाचकातिरिक्तस्यैव विषयप्रतिपादकत्वात् । विषयिप्रतिपादकातिरिक्तविषयप्रतिपादकाभावविवक्षायामपि---

"पल्लवत: कल्पतरोरेष विशेष: करस्य ते वीर[7] ।
भूषयति कर्णमेक: परस्तु कर्णं तिरस्कुरुते ।।"

इत्यत्र कर्णशब्दश्लेषमूलातिशयोक्ताव्याप्ति: । तत्र विषयविषयिणो: पृथक्कर्णपदोपादानाद्[8] विषयिप्रतिपादकविलक्षण[9]विषय[10]प्रतिपादकाभावो वा वि-वक्षित इति चेत्, तथापि---

"उरोभुवा[11] कुम्भयुगेन जृम्भितं नवोपहारेण वयस्कृतेन किम् ।
त्रपासरिद्दुर्गमपि प्रतीर्य सा[12] नलस्य तन्वी हृदयं विवेश यत्[13] ।।"

---

१- दीपदीप्त-क २- तस्या-क ३- अपि इति कपुस्तकेनास्ति ४- इत्यादाविदं-क ५- पद्मामानीवोदि--क ६- अतिव्याप्ति: -ख,ग,घ ७- वीर:-क ८- कर्णपादो-क ९- विषयप्रतिपादक--घ १०- विषय इति कपुस्तकेनास्ति ११- [redacted] उरोभुवा-क १२- यत्-क १३- सा-क ।

इत्यत्र कुचद्वये कुम्भयुगाभेदाध्यवसायरूपातिशयोक्तावव्याप्तिः[1]। तत्रोरःप्रभवत्वाकारेण[2] विषयप्रतिपादकस्य विषयिप्रतिपादकविलक्षणस्य सद्भावात्[3]। ननु विषयिप्रतिपादकविलक्षणस्य विषयतावच्छेदकप्रकारेण विषयप्रतिपादकस्याभावो विवक्षितः, उरःप्रभवत्वं तु न पयोधरयोर्विषयतावच्छेदकमनेकसाधारणत्वादिति चेत्, एवमपि---

"ध्वान्तस्य वामोरु विचारणायां वैशेषिकं चारु मतं मतं मे[4]।
औलूकमाहुः खलु दर्शनं यत्क्षमं तमस्तत्त्वनिरूपणाय[5]॥"

इत्यादावुलूकदर्शनमिति[6] वैशेषिकमते पक्षिविशेषदृष्ट्या भेदाध्यवसायरूपातिशयोक्तावव्याप्तिर्दुर्वारा। तत्र वैशेषिकमतमिति विषयतावच्छेदकप्रकारेण विषयप्रतिपादकस्य संभवात्। अपि चैवम् "रामरावणयोर्युद्धम्" इत्यनन्वयालंकारे चातिव्याप्तिः। तत्र विषयिप्रतिपादकविलक्षणविषयप्रतिपादकाभावात्[7]। ननु यत्र कश्चिदभेदेनाध्यवसीयते स विषयः, यस्तु तथाध्यवसीयते स विषयीति विषयविषयिभावोऽत्र विवक्षित इति नोक्तातिव्याप्तिरिति चेत्, एवमपि "विद्वन्मानसहंस" इत्यादिश्लिष्टरूपकेऽतिव्याप्तिर्दुर्वारा[8]। रूपके ताद्रूप्यारोपमात्रम्; अतिशयोक्तावभेदाध्यवसाय[9] इति कल्पना तु रूपकलक्षणविचार[10] एव निरस्ता। साद्रूप्यनिबन्धनसमासोक्त्युदाहरणेषु[11] चातिव्याप्तिः[12]।

"अप्पय्यचित्रमीमांसा[13] न मुदे कस्य मांसला[14]।
अनूरुरिव घर्मांशोरर्धेन्दुरिव[15] धूर्जटेः॥"

समाप्तश्चायं समुपलभ्यमानो ग्रन्थः।

-----

१- अव्याप्तेः-क २- प्रतुभवत्वाकारेण-क ३- संभवात्-क ४- नः -क ५- निरूपणायाम्-क ६- -वालुकदर्शन--क ७- विषयप्रतिपादकविलक्षण-घ- ८- दुर्निवारा-क ९- नातिशयोक्ता--क १०- रूपकविचारलक्षण-ख,ग,घ ११- अप्रस्तुतप्रशंसोदाहरणेषु-क, १२- अथ उपमा सदोपमेयोपमयाथानन्वयःस्मरणं। रूपकपरिणतिसंशयभ्रान्तिमदुल्लेखनिह्नुतिप्रदाः। इति कपुस्तके १३- अप्पयं (?)-क १४- मांसाला-क १५- तीक्ष्णांशो--क।

--

ENGLISH TRANSLATION

## English Translation

> Having paid homage to Mahādeva (lit. one who has the moon on his head), the spouse of Gaurī, the first and foremost light, I (proceed to) compose a treatise on the figures of speech based on varieties of ideas, having a wide range and clarity of theme.

Literature is of three types, namely, Dhvani (Suggestion), Guṇībhūtavyaṅga (with Suggestion as Subordinate) and Citra (Embellished).

Now, that is to be designated as Dhvani (kāvya) where the suggested sense is more prominent than the expressed sense. As for example,

> The drops of the first shower (when the season set in) stood for an instant on her (thick) eye-lashes, hit her lips, were pulverized by falling on her rising breast, were obstructed in the wrinkles (round her middle), and entered the navel after a long while.

Here, the position befitting the state of meditation of the goddess is revealed by the description of the natural movement of the first rain-drops on the body of the goddess, practising penance, and thereby, the state of meditation, undisturbed even at the advent of the first rain, which causes agitation owing to the feeling of pleasure while falling on one's body, heated by prolonged summer, is suggested. Thus, the state of those absorbed in meditation is described in these words :-

> Firmly fixing the chest at first, one should meditate inwardly upon the deity

with one's eyes fixed on the nose-tip, lips tightened and (the body) absolutely motionless.

Here (in this illustration), the half-closing of eyes in the form of fixing of the eyes on the nose-tip, is suggested by the expression 'pakṣmasu sthitā' (i.e. 'resting on eye-lashes'). For, if the eyes were fully opened, the eye-lashes would have remained erected and if the eyes were fully closed, the eye-lashes would have remained downwards, and in either way the drops of (rain) water could not exist there. That her lips are tightened is suggested by the statement that the (rain-drops), fallen from her eye-lashes, rolled on the upper and lower lips, without entering into the mouth, and fell therefrom. Again, that she kept her chest fixed is suggested by the description of their falling (i.e. falling of rain-drops) on the height of her breasts therefrom; for, if she had a leaned posture as in an idle state, they (i.e. rain-drops) could not fall on the height (of her breast) as the pair of breasts would have an inward contracted shape. Even if somehow they fell therefrom and reached the threefold wrinkle, they would have a tortuous movement (in the wrinkles) and could not reach to the region of navel and could not enter into her deep navel. That she is motionless
2 is suggested by the statement of falling (of rain-drops) from her eye-lashes, lower-lip etc. step by step; for in the case of movement of her face etc. falling (of rain-drops), that had (already) fallen on her eye-lash, from her lower-lip, breast etc. step by step would not have been possible. Further, by these very epithets, the uncommon beauty of the goddess is suggested. Thus, that her eye-lash was thick is suggested by the epithet 'sthitā' ('resting'). (Similarly) smoothness of them by the expression 'kṣaṇam' ('for a

while'), excessive softness of (her) lower-lip by the statement of oppression (on the lower-lip) by the rain-drops which had a slow movement on account of falling from the eye-lash, excessive hardness of (her) breasts by the description of their (i.e. the 'water-drops') pulverization on the slope of the breast, (although) having a slow movement on account of falling from the eye-lash, lower-lip etc., prominence of the wrinkles by the statement of their (i.e. the 'water-drops') movement over the wrinkles inspite of keeping of the chest fixed, excessive deepness of the navel by the statement of entering of all the rain-drops solely into the navel are suggested. Thus, this is an illustration of Dhvani as the suggested sense is more prominent than the expressed.

Similarly (the following verse is an example of Dhvani ) —

> Oh, the liar messenger ! slopes of your breasts have their sandal-paste completely removed, your lower-lip has completely lost its redness, eyes are destitude of collyrium at the corners, this slender body of yours is still thrilling; you are not aware of the advent of agony of your friend and you went from here to the tank to have a bath and not to that wretch.

Here, that you had gone nowhere but to that wretch for dalliance is suggested mainly by the word 'adhama' ('wretch') whereas the expressed sense is that you had gone to the tank to have a bath and not to him. Thus, wretchedness is lowness, which is possible by caste or deed. Now, a heroine of high order ('Uttama-nāyikā')

does not speak of the hero's lowness by caste. Again, it cannot be by any other deed than the low act, such as the dalliance with the messenger which is tantamount to his own fault. Deeds like those (other than dalliance with a messenger) committed before this dalliance with the messenger have been tolerated and need not be spoken of. Otherwise, sending of the messenger by herself cannot be justified. Even thereafter, since there can be a low conduct of dalliance with the messenger, sent by herself, which can be known by the exposed signs (with her) and which is indicated by the word 'adhama', it is suggested that you had gone nowhere but to him for dalliance. The clauses in 'niḥśeṣacyutacandanam stanataṭam' etc. play the role of helpers (in understanding the suggestion) by disclosing the signs of dalliance. How ? In the expression 'niḥśeṣacyutacandanaṃ stanataṭam' the adjunct 'niḥśeṣa' ('completely') is used to avoid the fault of accidental circumstance in the form of the removal of sandal paste by the pulling of upper garment, which will support here the expressed meaning that you had gone to the tank for a bath. The (word) 'taṭa' ('slope') is used to disclose the sign of dalliance by way of removing the possibility of removal of sandal-paste which is common to (dalliance as well as) bathing. For, in the case of bathing, sandal-paste would have been removed
3 from the entire body; but in your case (wiping of sandal-paste) is marked on the slope i.e. on the height of your breasts only and this (must be) due to embraces only. Similarly, in 'nirmṛṣṭārago'dharaḥ' complete wiping of the redness is said in the expression 'nirmṛṣṭarāgaḥ' in order to avoid the fault of accidental circumstance in the form of partly wiping of the earlier redness due to the delayed taking of betel-leaf. Again

'adhara' ('lower lip') is specifically mentioned to disclose the signs of dalliance by way of distinguishing it from the signs common to bathing (also). That (her) upper-lip remains with redness while the redness of the lower lip only has been completely wiped off, is undoubtedly due to kisses. In the expression 'netre dūram anañjane' the epithet 'dūram' is used to avoid the fault of accidental circumstance (in the form) of partly rubbing out of the collyrium, applied in the morning, due to the passage of time. 'Dūram' apparently means 'excessively'. Collyrium would have rubbed out from everywhere (i.e. from the entire eye) in the case of (passage) of time or bathing; but in your case, some corner (of your eyes only) is devoid of collyrium and this must be due to kisses. In 'pulakitā tanvī taveyaṃ tanuḥ', apparently the signs of bathing have been presented by the mention of the thrilled (body) in the epithet 'pulakitā', along with the statement of natural slenderness, in the epithet 'tanvī'. But the (real) syntax lying in heart (of the speaker) is 'pulakitā-pi tanvī vartate' (i.e. 'your body remains slender although thrilled'). Thus, a body thrilled by a bath becomes slighfly swelled up. But this (body) is not so and hence the slenderness and the erection of bristling hair are due to the languor of sexual enjoyment only. This is the explanation of the inner meaning. Similarly, the address 'mithyāvādini' relating to an idea conforming to (the statement) that you had gone to the tank for a bath which we get at the prior stage of expression, leads to the idea conforming to the suggestion that you had gone nowhere but to him for dalliance which is being suggested by the epithet 'adhama'ṃ based on these statements. Hence, this is also an illustration of

Suggestion, as the suggested meaning of this (verse), to which the expressed meaning is made subordinate, is more prominent than the expressed meaning.

Where the suggested sense is not more prominent than the expressed sense, that is called Guṇībhūtavyaṅgya (Suggestion as Subordinate).

For example —

O Accyuta, I am going. Is any satisfaction to be obtained from merely looking at you ? In fact, "if we remain together in this solitary place, wretched people will think quite otherwise". — After the cow-girl had signified her depression and languor due to the futile stay by the special form of address, Kṛṣṇa embraced her and the hairs on his body were thrilled. May Kṛṣṇa, in this condition, protect you.

Here, the words of taking leave, such as 'May I leave Accyuta', suggest that I waited so long to enjoy your company but could not get it. This establishes the expressed idea 'ityāmantraṇabhaṅgisūcitavṛthāvasthānakhedālasām' ('one, who had signified one's depression and langour due to futile stay by a special form of
4 address'); hence it is subordinate to the latter and therefore does not exceed the expressed idea. Thus this is a case of Guṇībhūtavyaṅgya.

Another example of this type is the following verse —

Would you, my lord ! be back to this place on the expiry of a 'prahara' (part

> of the day) or at noon, or even later, or at sunset' — with such bewailings attended with flowing tears, a girl prevents her husband from his journey to a place that requires one hundred days to be reached.

Here the suggestion, viz., that the entire day is the maximum limit after which I cannot bear life any longer, establishes the expressed sense, namely, preventing her beloved from the journey; as such it is subordinate to the latter and, thus, not more charming than the expressed sense. Therefore, this is also an illustration of Guṇībhūtavyaṅgya.

That is to be called Citra (Embellished) which is charming although void of any suggestion.

This is of three types, namely, Śabdacitra ('striking in words'), Arthacitra ('striking in sense') and Ubhayacitra ('striking in both'). The following is an illustration of Śabdacitra —

> He saw before him the spring, fragrant with an exuberence of flowers, under whose influence the Palāśa forest had assumed a fresh foliage, the lotus was filled with manifest pollen and the tender ends of plants were fading.

An example of Arthacitra is the following —

> That column of dust separated from the surface of the earth (lit. cut asunder from its root) by blood and wafted by the current of the wind over it, looked like the smoke, that ■ had raised before, of the fire which now remains in embers only.

The following is an example of Ubhayacitra —

May He, the Divine Boar, who at the end of the Kalpa (cycle of creation) upheld the earth agitating the water of the ocean, shower blessings on you. The cracking sounds of crores of stones split by the kicks of his hoofs and then knocking downwards from the tops of the big mountains, obviously served as the sounds of the auspicious drum.

Of these three types of literature, elaboration with regard to Dhvani and Guṇībhūtavyaṅgya has been made elsewhere by us. As the Śabdacitra is mostly insipid, poets do not respect it. Moreover, we do not find there matters deserving much consideration. This is why, leaving the portion relating to Śabdacitra, a lucid and extensive treatise on Arthacitra is being commenced.

In offering definitions and examples,
5 while a group of figures is to be considered, verses mostly of the elders are cited here.

Here ends the introduction to the text of Citra-mīmāṃsā.

-: oOo :-

> Upamā (Simile), the unique actress, plays different roles and delights the hearts of connoisseur dancing on the stage that assumes the form of literature.

The presentation of similarity (noticed) in the expression 'the face looks like the moon', the figure is Upamā (Simile). That very Upamā assumes the form of various figures of speech according to variations in the modes of expression. As for example : In 'the face is like the moon and the moon is like the face' -- the figure is Upameyopamā (Reciprocal comparison). In 'the face is like the face' -- it is Ananvaya (Self-comparison). In 'the moon is like the face' -- it is Pratīpa (Converse). In 'having seen the moon I remember her face' -- the figure is Smaraṇa (Reminiscence). In 'the face itself is the moon' -- it is Rūpaka (Metaphor). In '(he) is relieved of agony by her moon-like face' -- it is Pariṇāma (Commutation). In 'Is it a face or the moon ?' -- the figure is Sandeha (Doubtful). In 'the Cakora birds taking your face for the moon are running towards you' -- it is Bhrāntimān (Error). In 'the Cakora-birds and the bees are getting attracted taking your face for the moon and the lotus respectively' -- the figure is Ullekha (Representation). In 'it is the moon and not a face' -- it is Apahnava (Denial). In 'Surely it is the moon' -- the figure is Utprekṣā (Poetical Fancy). In 'this is the moon' -- it is Atiśayokti (Hyperbole). In '(both) the moon and the lotus are defeated by (your) face' -- the figure is Tulyayogitā (Equal Pairing). In 'the moon and your face shine at night' -- it is Dīpaka (Illuminator). In 'I am attracted only by your face, whereas the Cakora bird is delighted (lit. gets ready) by the moon only' -- it is Prativastūpamā (Typical

Comparison). In 'the moon in the sky, your face on the earth' — the figure is Dṛṣṭānta (Exemplification). In 'your face possesses the lusture of the moon' — it is Nidarśanā (Illustration). In 'the spotless face of yours excells the moon' — it is Vyatireka (Contrast). In 'at night, moon along with your face, looks beautiful' — it is Sahokti (Connected Description). 'Your face, beautiful owing to the lunar-marks (therein) in the form of eyes is decked with moonbeams in the form of your smile' — here it is Samāsokti (Speech of Brevity). 'Your face bears resemblence to the lotus which has connection (āhita-śakti) with water (hari) or with the moon born of the ocean (abja) having connection with the deer (hariṇāhitaśakti)' — here the figure is Śleṣa (Paronomasia). In 'the moon looks gloomy in the presence of your face' — the figure is Aprastutapraśaṃsā (Indirect Description). Thus, this figure Upamā assumes the appearances of several figures as stated above.

As this wonderful universe becomes known with the realisation of Brahman, similarly, the entire realm of embellished poetry is known with the knowledge of Upamā. Hence, this figure, with all its varieties, is being defined in the beginning.

This figure has been defined thus —

The charming similarity between two ideas
(one) having the capability of being an
Upamāna(standard of comparison) (and the
other) an Upameya (subject of
6 comparison), is designated as
Upamā by the literary critics.

The similarity (between two ideas) having the capability of being an Upamāna and Upameya in accordance with the literary convention only, is called an Upamā but not so when the similarity is otherwise. This is why, 'the face is bright like the lily' etc., are not cases of Upamā. Similarity, not charming on account of being based on matter, substance etc., is not a similar case even if it fulfills the said condition. Only the charming similarity, viz., delightfulness etc., (is considered as component of an Upamā). All the figures of speech, only when they embellish the literature strikingly in accordance with the literary convention attain recognition as 'alaṃkāra' (i.e., a figure of speech). Hence, the expression 'the gavaya is like a cow', is not a case of Upamā. 'The Vāhīka is (like) a bull' — is not a case of Rūpaka (Metaphor). 'Whether it is a post or a man' — is not a case of Sasandeha (Doubtful). 'It is silver' — is not a case of Bhrāntimān (Error). 'This is not a snake' — is not a case of Apahnuti (Denial). 'The faty Devadatta takes no meal at day-time' — is not a case of Paryāyokta (Periphrasis). 'The mountain is fiery' — is not a case of Anumāna (Inference). 'He is Devadatta' — is not a case of Smaraṇa (Reminiscence). 'tas, thas, tha and mip (are replaced by) tām, tam, ta and am (respectively)' — is not a case of Yathāsaṃkhya (Relative Order). 'The father has come with the son' — is not a case of Sahokti (Connected Description). 'He has gone without him' — is not a case of Vinokti (Speech of Absence). 'śveto dhāvati' [(1) the white (horse) is running and (2) the dog runs (from this place)] — is not a case of Śleṣa (Paronomasia). (Similarly) other examples are to be understood. Now, why the adjunct 'dvayoḥ' is (included) here, is being considered. If you say that in order to exclude the figure

Ananvaya, in which the similarity is expressed by comparing an object to itself (the adjunct 'dvayoḥ' is included in the definition), then also it would be too wide a definition with regard to Pratīpa (Converse) where the Upamāna is conceived as the Upameya, and Upameyopamā (Reciprocal Comparison) where two objects are conceived as Upameya by rotation. If you want to take them as Upamā on the ground that the description of similarity exists there also, then the figure Ananvaya also would deserve inclusion (there) and hence meaningless would be the word 'dvayoḥ'. Thus, the term 'bheda' included in the definition (of Upamā) offered in the Kāvyaprakāśikā, namely, 'Upamā is (the description of) similarity of (two) different objects' with a view to excluding the figure Ananvaya, is hereby refuted. Not that the description of real similarity only constitutes Upamā, so that the exclusion of Ananvaya due to impossibility of similarity with its own self and the inclusion of the other two would be possible. If it would happen so, then in the example like 'your glorious performance as white as that of a goose is bathing in the heavenly Ganges' etc., where the figure Upamā is drawn from a similarity fancied by the poet (only), the question of absence of Upamā would arise. Moreover, even taking it granted that there is the eligibility of being an Upamāna and an Upameya and the charmingness too, it would be too wide (a definition) with regard to an Upamā, faulty on account of divergence in gender, number etc. as (is found) in 'the moon is white like a goose (and) the sky is clear like pools' etc. It would be too wide (a definition) with regard to
7 the suggestion of Upamā to be exemplified later on. This is, by no means, a figure of speech as that itself is the subject of embellishment and as the

appellation of Alaṃkāradhvani (i.e. suggestion of a figure of speech) has been decidedly accepted (by them) by the maxim 'brāhmaṇaśramaṇa' (i.e. the Brahmin turned to a Buddhist monk). If you take the definition of Upamā in general irrespective of faulty or faultless and subject of figure or a figure and say that the aforesaid fault of (being) too wide a definition is not involved then the adjuncts 'upamānopameyatvayogyayoḥ' and 'hṛdyam' also become meaningless, for, (in that case), Upamā although faulty on account of the lack of literary convention would have to be admitted.

As regard the definition (of Upamā) offered by Vidyānātha (it runs thus) —

> That is to be called Upamā where the natural ('dharmataḥ') similarity of the subject of description is expressed once with something else (i.e. Upamāna) which is established, different (from the Upameya) and agreeable (to the poets).

Here, the figure Utprekṣā is excluded by the adjunct 'svataḥsiddhena' as the Upamāna there, is not widely known among the people at large owing to the fact that it is fancied by the poet. Exclusion of the figure Ananvaya is made by the adjunct 'bhinnena'. Exclusion of all types of faulty simile is made by the adjunct 'sammatena'; since all types of simile which are not fit to be employed owing to lack of familiarity in the circle of poets or owing to (faults like) divergence in respect of gender and number, are excluded by the term 'sammata'. The figure Śleṣa is excluded by the term 'dharmataḥ'. In Śleṣa, as in examples like 'sakalakalaṃ

purametajjātam sampratisudhāmśubimbam iva' (i.e. 'this city has become 'sakalakala', full of noise and hence resembles the disc of the moon which is 'sakalakala', i.e. complete with all its digits), similarity in point of words only is conveyed by the term 'iva' and not the similarity from the standpoint of attribute or action. The (figure) Pratīpa is excluded by the expression 'anyena varṇyasya', because, there the similarity of the non-contextual idea with the subject of comparison is described. The figure Upameyopamā is excluded by the term 'ekedā'. Suggested simile is excluded by the term 'vācyam'. Now, the statement, that for the exclusion of the figure Utprekṣā the term 'svataḥsiddhena' is used — is unjustified; since, in Utprekṣā where the expression 'iva' gives the idea of possibility of identity etc., between the Upamāna and the Upameya, the similarity is not expressed there and thus it (i.e. Utprekṣā) would be automatically excluded. Hence said Chakravartin :-

> Where the element of comparison is well-known among the people, there it is an Upamā and in that case, the term 'iva' is an expressive of similarity.
>
> But, if this element is not well-known among the people and has its origin in the poet's fancy, the figure will be Utprekṣā.

Moreover, the term 'iva' as expressive of probability is also noticeable in the popular usage as in 'the man standing afar appears to be Devadatta'. How again

can the exclusion of Utprekṣā be done by this (use of) 'svataḥsiddhena', since in the very following verse —

> The king of Navakākatī, delighting (the
> people) by his own lustre shines on
> earth as if the moon which (having
> thought) that there is no complete-
> 8 ness here (i.e. in the sky) for
> all time, has descended on earth
> leaving the firmament.

(which is) an example of Utprekṣā, given by himself, the element of Upamāna is already established. If you say that the moon is poetically fancied in respect of its descend on earth (only), then the definition will be too narrow to cover the following verse given as an example of Asambhābitopamā (i.e. simile involving impossibility) —

> Like poison (issuing) from the lunar
> disc, like fire (issuing) from sandalwood,
> from this face issues harsh words. This
> is an example of 'Asambhābitopamā'.

Since, though poison and fire are real by their existence, the statement of the moon and the sandal as their origin is a feat of poetic imagination.

(Moreover), the definition will be too narrow by all means to cover the following verse given as an example of Upamā where the element of Upamāna owes its origin to poetic imagination (only) —

> Had a couple of separate streams from the
> water of the 'Heavenly Ganges' fallen on

the sky, (then only) his chest which is as dark as that of a Tamāla tree and (decorated) with a hanging string of pearls might be compared with it.

The term 'bhinnena', included (in the definition) with a view to excluding the figure 'Ananvaya' is also unjustified. For, in

Being a mine of an endless quantity of gems, — the snow on the top of this mountain could not efface its attractiveness; for one solitary fault merges in an accumulation of (a great many) merits as the stain of the moon merges in its rays.

where the simile is drawn for supporting an idea, it will be found too narrow; since, in this case the particular blemishes and qualities viz. the 'stain' andthe 'rays' respectively are included in the general blemishes and qualities of the Upameya and hence cannot be deemed as distinct from one another. If however, it is said that the distinction of the Upamāna from it (i.e. the Upameya) consists in the distinction of the determining property of the Upamāna, which is different from the determining property of the Upameya, that also would not be justified; since (the definition) would suffer from being too narrow in an example of Raśanopamā (Chain of Similies) as stated below :-

When the king brings together hosts of supplicants like waves on his hand which is full of water used in his continuous

gifts of gold, his mind is like his words, like his mind are his actions and like his actions is his highly pure fame.

since, 'matitva' etc., which are the 'upamānatāvacchedaka's i.e. determining properties in respect of Upamāna (in the succeeding ones) have no distinction from the determining properties in respect of the Upameyas (applied in the preceeding clauses). Moreover, the term 'ekadā' (used in the definition) turns to be redundant as the exclusion of Upameyopamā is established by the very adjunct used beforehand, (viz., 'bhinnena') because of the absence of mutual distinction in both the two determining properties of Upamāna, used in the figure Upameyopamā. Again, in —

Covering the sky with the dust thrown up by the chariots, and earth with the dark cloud-like elephants, Raghu changed the sky into the earth and the earth into the sky.

which is to be cited as an illustration of 'Parasparopamā' in the section dealing with Upameyopamā, it (i.e. the definition of Upamā offered by Vidyānātha) would become too narrow. Now, if it is argued that the difference of Upamāna (from the Upameya) consists in its being characterised by an attribute which is distinct per se from the determining property of the Upameya in question, that too would not be proper; for, the definition would be too narrow to cover the following examples of 'abhinna-dharmikopamā' (i.e. Upamā, based on objects which are virtually identical) —

9 The thousand-beamed luminary (the Sun) held over his head a sun-shade newly made by the artisan of the gods. When the crest of the

Lord was not very far from its white silken fringe, it seemed as if the stream of Gaṅgā was falling upon his head.

The beggar, going door to door, does not beg but teaches thus — 'Be like yourself by giving and be not like myself by giving nothing.

Since, the very determining factor of the Upameya in question, viz., 'parameśvaratva' or the like turns to be the determining factor of the Upamāna too. It would also be unjustified to say that the adjunct 'dharmataḥ' is used to exclude the figure Śleṣa, for, not only the similarity in words but the similarity in respect of attributes too is expressed there by the term 'iva' and hence the figure Śleṣa could not be excluded. It would also be incorrect if you say that in the case of the city 'sakalakalatva' means 'full of rapid loud sounds' and in the case of lunar orb it means 'complete aggregation of lunar digits' (and thus) there is no common property available here — because, the commonness of property is ~~available here — because, the commonness of property is~~ admitted here by the 'bhede'bheda' (i.e. imagination of identity although different are the objects) variety of the figure Atiśayokti, basis of which is the complete identification based on Śleṣa. Not that the figure Upamā consists in the primary commonness of the property belonging to Upamāna and Upameya both; since, in

Here sits the king of Pāṇḍus, who had applied scented paste of ~~red~~ new sandle to his body, from whose shoulders hang down the

> pearl-garlands and who looks like the king of the mountains whose summits are reddened with the rays of the morning sun and which has rivulets flowing downwards.

etc., commonness of property subsisting between 'scented paste of red sandle' and 'the morning sun' and pearl-garland' and 'rivulets', has been admitted although considered on the basis of 'Bimbapratibimba-bhāva' (i.e. process of reflected representation). If it is said that as in 'sakalakalam' etc., too, there exists the similarity in attributes and as such it may be a case of Upamā, (then also it may be contended) that, should it not be a case of Upamā even where it is based on the similarity in words only. For, this is not a convention that similarity in attributes etc. other than that in verbal expression only is the determining factor of Upamā and not the similarity in verbal expression, because, Upamā is admitted in (the following verse)

> He became king in the real sense of the word on account of his pleasing disposition towards the subjects, as the moon (verifies the signification of its name) on account of its power to please and the sun on account of its scorching brightness.

10 (also), where similarity is found with regard to an expression in the form of a significant name (only). But as the figure Śleṣa has no scope exclusive of any other figure and hence stronger (than other figures) due to its 'scopelessness', it will supersede other figures and hence, it is the figure Ślesa, which is responsible for the cognition of Upamā, has to be admitted and not Upamā though there is an appearance

of Upamā. This has been admitted by (the rhetoricians like) Maṅkhaka and others. Thus, as Śleṣa is a bar where the appearance of Upamā is found to be based on the similarity in words and as the same may be similarly maintained where there is an appearance of Upamā which is based on similarity in common attributes attained through complete identification based on Śleṣa, the expulsion of commonness in attributes for the sake of that (i.e. 'bādhakatva') is not justified. What has been said by Rudraṭa while justifying the figure Upamā in the expression 'sakalakalam' etc. (is this ) —

> Upamā and Samuccaya (Conjunction) are clearly figures based on ideas; but in the case in question (of the passage 'sakalakalam' etc.) also they are possible on the basis of the similitude in verbal expression only.

Here, the point of similarity with regard to verbal expression only is mentioned. But it becomes clear in the end that it has been said with this intention in view that Upamā can be supported even ~~basing~~ where it is based on similarity in respect of verbal expression only and not to say that commonness of attribute is not possible by complete identification also, because, similarity, by means of complete identification, in the adjuncts pertaining to Śleṣa also, has been accepted by all in other figures of speech. Thus Śleṣa cannot be excluded by the expression 'dharmataḥ'. In fact, in 'sakalakalam' etc., obviously the figure is Upamā and hence redundant is the adjunct 'dharmataḥ'. The scope of Śleṣa as different from that of other figures, will be shown in the section dealing with it.

Moreover, the argument that Śleṣa will supersede other figures as it has no separate scope, is also unjustified, since, the hurdle of scopelessness is overcome by merely having a field (for it) and thus the dispute with regard to 'separate scope' is out of question. This is not the popular convention noted in the science of poetics that there should be a separate scope (for everything); since, unperforated gems, (the use of which is) dependent on (the use of) gold, as being causes of beauty are treated as separate ornaments (viz. gem-ornaments) although they have no scope without being used with gold. Otherwise, the status of gold as ornament, to which the unperforated gems are dependent and which has (many) scopes, would have been checked by the unperforated gems, laid on (an ornament). ~~Nor~~ It is not a 'shastric nyāya' (i.e., a rule prevalent in a particular science) agreeable to the Mīmāṃsakas also, since, the individual existence of the (vedic) statements like 'pade juhoti' etc., having a mere scope, is established like the statements like 'uttarārdhe juhoti' etc., although having no scope outside the range of Āhavanīya Shastra etc. ~~Nor~~ It is not a special rule relating to this science i.e., the science of poetics also. Though Sahokti etc. have no separate scope from that of Atiśayokti etc., the formers are accepted as separate figures of speech without barring the latters and thus the want of opposition lies the same here also. Therefore, the statement that here the figure is Śleṣa giving rise to the cognition of Upamā, is unjustified. On the
contrary, Upamā is (the figure) here giving rise
11 to the cognition ~~of Upama, is unjustified. On the contrary, Upama is (the figure) here giving rise to the cognition~~ of Śleṣa. The knowledge of another meaning in the form of aggregation of lunar digits from

'sakalakalam' in the context of description of the city, is not possible unless the simile in 'sudhāṃśubimbamiva' which is a qualifying expression to that is used. The statement that in order to exclude the figure Pratīpa, the expression 'anyena varṇyasya sāmyam' has been used — is unjustified; since, then the expression 'anyena' is rendered tautologous by the adjunct 'bhinna'. Moreover, if the idea is that (of the similarity of the contextual) with something non-contextual i.e. different from the 'varṇya' i.e. 'prakṛta (i.e. contextual) is intended, then it will be too narrow to cover the following example of Samuccitopamā (i.e. Upamā involving the idea of conjunction ) :-

> Other demons also fell on the crores of monkeys. They appeared like dust raised from the battlefield falling upon the streams of their blood. —

because, the fall of dust on blood as part of battle also is the subject of description (i.e. contextual) here. If the idea is that (of similarity) with something somehow virtually different from the contextual irrespective of whether it is contextual or non-contextual then in Pratīpa, where owing to superb qualities even the Upamāna seems to be improper, it would be too wide. As for example :-

> O poison, do not you, my dear, be puffed up at the idea that you are the greatest of terrible things; verily there abound in this world the words of the wicked, which are just like yourself.

Here, for the commonness of the words of the mischievous persons, which (in the present context) form the subject of comparison, with the Hālāhala (i.e. a type of deadly poison), which is being considered as unfit to be the Upamāna for its very prominent ~~attributes~~ blemishes, the figure is Pratīpa. Here, the expression 'varṇyasya' (used in the definition offered by Vidyānātha) also, is unjustified; since, it will be too narrow to cover the following example of Upamā inter-mingled with Aprastutapraśaṃsā — "the moon light, before the glorious performances of yours, looks gloomy by its darkness (from stain)" — because, moonlight is not the subject of comparison owing to the fact that it is the glorious performance which is the subject of comparison here. Moreover, what does the expression 'anyena varṇyasya sāmyaṃ vācyam' mean ? Whether the similarity pertaining to the subject of comparison having a counter-entity from other or the similarity determined by both the subject and standard of comparison attained through somehow or the similarity pertaining to the subject of comparison is expressed ? In the first case, it would be too narrow to cover such example of Ubhayaviśrānta-sādṛśyopamā (i.e., Simile, where the similarity is established on both sides) as noticed in "This lotus and the face of hers are the same (in beauty) and hence (it) causes delight in my heart". In the second case, it would be too wide with regard to the well-known examples of Pratīpa and the condition lies the same. Similarly, in the third case, as the desired meaning is achieved by the mere expression 'varṇyasya sāmyam', the term 'anyena'

12

becomes useless. The adjunct 'ekadā', used with a view to excluding the figure Upameyopamā, also is unjustified, since, though the fault of being too wide a definition with regard to Upameyopamā where the ~~upamana~~

figure is introduced (through the interchange of Upamāna and Upameya) in seriatim as in the example like "the water is like the sky and the sky is like the water" etc., can be avoided by it (i.e., the term 'ekadā'), the fault of being too wide (a definition with regard to Upameyopamā) where the interchange is simultaneous, as noticed in the following verse, cannot be avoided.

> Let therefore the two obtain at once mutual similitude by their sweet simultaneous opening — the two, namely, your eye with the pupil, far from rough, rolling about within, and the lotus with a black-bee moving inside.

Moreover, it would be too narrow to cover such an example of Mālopamā (as given below) where the common properties are different as the similarity is established there in diverse ways —

> A woman of attractive buttocks is a delight to the eyes like the moon, a cause of intoxication like wine and an attraction to all people like sovereignty.

It is not worth saying that the figure Mālopamā is not a single figure as it is a collection of many similies and the characteristic (of Upamā) is indeed present in each case, for, in that case, as Upameyopamā is an amalgamation of Upamā and Pratīpa, the use of another adjunct for the exclusion of that becomes irrelevant. The statement of other authors on poetics regarding figures, distinct from Saṃsṛṣṭi and Saṃkara, remains the same with regard to

both (i.e. Mālopamā and Upameyopamā). Similarly, it would be too narrow to cover such example of Parasparopamā, namely, "rajobhiḥ syandanoddhūtaiḥ" etc., which is to be exemplified in the section on Upameyopamā. The statement that in order to exclude suggested Upamā, the term 'vācyam' is used (in the definition), — is also unjustified; since, the question of being too narrow (a definition) ~~with regard~~ to cover the following example of 'Tattvākhyānopamā' (i.e., Upamā based on statement of facts) would arise, since the commonness is not expressed (there).

> This is not a lotus, but really a face;
> these two are not bees but eyes. —
> This is certainly (an example of)
> Tattvākhyānopamā.

The question of being too narrow to cover such example of Viśiṣṭopamādyākṣiptaviśeṣaṇādyupamā (i.e., Upamā, based on attributes etc., implied by the simile based on the qualified) as noticed in (verses) like the following one also, would arise.

> Your face, with tender eyes and
> displaying shining brilliance of teeth,
> shines like a lotus which displays (shining) filaments and wherein bees hover.

The objection of being too narrow to cover such example of 'Vācakaluptopamā' (i.e., Upamā, where the word expressive of similarity is dropped) as noticed in "one (female) having scimiter-bluish lustre" etc., and 'Sāmyalakṣakapadavadupamā' (i.e., Upamā, where there is a word indicating i.e., conveying by Lakṣaṇā, similarity) as noticed in "face, intimate to the moon" etc. also, will arise.

Moreover, (the question) ~~arises~~ whether in the expression 'vācyam', expressiveness is intended as predicate or as a subject (arises). In the first case, this definition {will be applicable} only in examples like the following one —

He, leading with him his great army going toward the eastern sea, looked like
13 Bhagīratha who led the Gaṅgā fallen from the matted hair of Hara.

{but it would not be applicable} in the following example and the like.

He, equal to Indra in his valour, marched first of all towards the east, menacing his enemies, as it were, with his flags unfurled in the air.

In the second case, it (i.e., the definition of Upamā) will be applicable also in the following example of Vyatireka where the similarity is a subject owing to its having a negation as predicate ~~as in the following example~~ — "The moon is not equal (in beauty) to your face which is without any stain."

~~Nor~~ It is not so that 'vācyam' has to be qualified as standing against the counter-entity of negation (niṣedhāpratiyogī), since, even then, it would be too wide with regard to the following example of Vyatireka —

This person, possessed of great dignity, did not become proud like other inferior persons, when suppressed his enemies with the help of his sword only.

It is not so that 'vācyam' has to be qualified as not included in the counter-entity-end of negation, since, it would be too narrow to cover the following example (of Upamā) of which the standard of comparison is dropped :-

> O my hornet ! why do you wonder in vain
> in various regions of the garden ? Even
> if you wonder, nowhere would you find (a
> flower) similar to this Mālatī (one).

Since, the similarity too, is set inside the counter-entity end because of (its) negation of the discovery of a similar one there. Hence, the definition said by Vidyānātha also, is unjustified.

As regards the following definition offered in the Sarasvatīkaṇṭhābharaṇa —

> What is a close mutual connection of common
> properties of two ideas in accordance with
> a convention, is intended here to be Upamā.

that too, is too narrow to cover the following example of Upamā where the mutual similarity with regard to attribute, action etc. is described.

> Trodden by hoops of horses, the dust of Elā
> (cardamon) fruits rose up and clung to the
> temples of the infuriated elephants, having
> a similar odour.

It would also be too narrow to cover the cases of Kalpitopamā (Upamā drawn through poetic fancy) as noticed in the following instances and other, where the standard of comparison is not based on convention :-

> The disc of the moon, as brown as that of a full-grown lotus-stalk and which looks like the setting of the raised breast, fallen on account of being pressed at the time of dalliance with the Hūṇa ~~ladies~~ young girls, advanced in pregnancy, manifests the first stepping of Lord Viṣṇu, by its fresh rays.

and "The orange vieing with the chin of a drunken

14 Hūṇa, just shaven."

The author of the Alaṃkāra-sarvasva has stated as follows — "Upamā consists either in the commonness of property or in the similarity admitting of (both) the distinction and identity between the standard and subject of comparison. There are three varieties of commonness in property : where the distinction is predominant, as noticed in Dīpaka (Illuminator), Tulyayogitā (Equal Paring), Dṛṣṭānta (Exemplification), Prativastūpamā (Parallel), Sahokti (Speech with 'With'), Vyatireka (Distinction) etc.; where the identity is predominant, as noticed in Rūpaka (Metaphor), Pariṇāma (Superimposition), Bhrāntimat (Error), Ullekha (Representation) etc.; where both the two are equal (in predominance), as noticed here in Upamā. Here, from the standpoint of special attributes relating to the standard and subject of comparison, there exists a distinction, but identity from the standpoint of common attribute and thus both are equal." That too, it is evident, is faulty on account of being too wide etc. relating to the standard and subject of comparison. Thus, it is difficult to offer a definition of this (figure).

It may be stated here :

> If the function of comparing is desired to last until the culmination of action, the figure of speech is Upamā.

(Here), 'Upamānavyāpāra' (i.e., the function of comparing) means the function that establishes the description of similarity; (or in other words), the description of similarity (itself). If that (function) is desired to culminate in comparison — (it imerges as) the figure Upamā. This is the explanation (of the definition). Thus, it would not be too wide with regard to Vyatireka, since, the description of comparison is not established there because of a direct negation (of similarity) noticed in the example "with (your) face which is stainless" and a negation of attributes leading to that (i.e. similarity) as noticed in the example "Not like other inferior persons", although there exists the description of similarity. It would not be too wide with regard to Ananvaya also; since, there also, the function relating to comparison is not established, as the similarity with itself is described as a foreword to (the idea) that there is nothing like it, like the description of admonition or admiration from some non-existent ideas met in the Arthavādavākyas like "Rudrarodana" and "Vapotkhanana" and others. Otherwise, had the comparison with itself been established, the suggestion of uniqueness from all aspects, inspite of the idea of exclusion of a similar one, could not be obtained. Whereas Bhāmaha and others have pointed out that very (idea) as the resultant of that —

> Where an object occupies the position of both the standard and subject of comparison

with relation to its own self, that is the figure Ananvaya — they say, with an intention (on the part of the poet) to express the idea of having no similar one."

This is why the authors of Alaṃkārasarvasva and others recommend the derivation of the word 'ananvaya' from the idea that the description of commonness of property with itself does not suit, although described. Thus, as by applying alum-powder to water, water is rendered absolutely clear by means of elimination of other particles of dust (at first) and then vanishing of the dust
of alum-powder itself, similarly, as after the
15 exclusion of a similar one while comparing some-
thing to itself, it becomes impossible to have a simile in fact with itself as noticed in (the example) "The fight between Rāma and Rāvaṇa is comparable to the fight between Rāma and Rāvaṇa (only)," the convention among the poets is the idea that unique is the fight between Rāma and Rāvaṇa, and thus, as the description of similarity does not culminate (in comparison) — there is no scope of doubt of being too-wide with regard to Ananvaya. Similarly, in Pratīpa too, wherealso the description of similarity does not culminate (in comparison), as noticed in the following verse and others, there is no apprehension for being too-wide (with regard to it), since, it is devoid of culminating in comparison.

Listen to this censurable (scandalous)
statement that has spread over the earth,
lotus-eyed one; the uncultivated boors
compare the moon to your charming face.

The following verse —

> O my good lady, why do you bear this unjustified pride on account of your pairs of eyes ? Indeed, there are such blue lotusses in lakes in every direction.

and the like are to be taken as cases of both Pratīpa and Upameyopamā and thus to cover them (i.e. the above verse and the like) is not a fault of the definition. Thus, the figure Pratīpa, met in the (above) illustrated verse, is a particular variety of Upamā only, since, reminiscence, metaphor, doubt, illusion, concealment from different aspects, imagination, support from a relation of possible connection etc. also, consisting in the description of similarity relating to the non-contextual, are not admitted as figures separate from those relating to the contextual. In default, it is to be presumed that status of figures of speech with regard to Smaraṇa, Rūpaka, Sasandeha, Bhrāntimān, Ullekha, Apahnuti, Utprekṣā, Nidarśanā, Arthāntaranyāsa and the like is to be admitted in cases of objects which are contextual only and not the same in cases of objects non-contextual. That reminiscence etc. are treated as figures of speech in objects which are not contextual as in objects which are contextual, would be exemplified in the relevant context. There is no such rule regarding Upamā that the figure will arise only in the form of a description of similarity subsisting between an object which is contextual and (another) non-contextual; since, in the illustrations of Samuccayopamā etc., Upamā is admitted in the description of similarity where (both the two are) either contextual or non-contextual. Similarly, it is justified to say that the description of similarity of an object which is non-contextual with an object which is contextual, is also, obviously a case of

Upamā. Similarly, figure Upameyopamā also does not occupy the status of a separate figure as it is formed of a couple of similies subsisting between an object which is contextual and (another) non-contextual. In default, the question of admitting Parasparopamā, example of which is being given in the chapter on that (i.e. Upameyopamā), as an individual figure arises and the status of a separate figure has also to be admitted in the cases of (poetic devices) arising out of reciprocal error etc. Nor can you say that it is unjustified to admit that out of the figures Ananvaya, Pratīpa and Upameyopamā, Ananvaya would be excluded from and the other two be included in Upamā, since, description of similarity and a particular mode of description are common to all these. For, the distinction between them is quite clear, as, where the description of
16 similarity is accomplished we find the word Upamā having its use and where that (i.e. the description of similarity) is not accomplished, the same is not found. With this particular end in view, much care has been taken in the definitions met in Kāvyaprakāśikā and others to exclude the figure Ananvaya and not to exclude the figure Upameyopamā. Even if Upameyopamā and others are included in Upamā, there exists no contradiction in considering them as separate figure, because of (their) individual variety arising out of suggestion etc., as in the case of Rūpaka and Pariṇāma. That (this) definition does not cover the illustrations like "Had there been two separate streams in the firmament", is not a fault, since, had there actually existed two streams as described, then it might be compared. But those (two) are not possible and hence no one compares (the bosom with such a pair of streams). Thus, it becomes a variety of Upamā. Accordingly, even if Upamā is admitted in a case where the

function of comparing is not accomplished, the term Upamā becomes a technical one. In fact, there the figure is a particular variety of Atiśayokti. This is why, in the Kāvyaprakāśikā, the variety 'prastutasya yadanyatvam yadyarthoktau ca kalpanam' (i.e., otherwise representation of the contextual matter and imagination of an idea expressed by <u>if</u>) has been included in the figure Atiśayokti and the verse —

> If the body of the moon were to be spotless on the full-moon night (rākā), then her face would suffer the defeat of resemblance.

has been cited as illustration of 'Yadyarthokti' ('expression by <u>if</u>')

> If a flower reclined on a delicate leaf, or a pearl were placed upon a spotless coral bead, then there would be an imitation of her bright smile, with its lustre spread over her scarlet lips.

The above verse is an example of what is known as Utpādyopamā (Upamā, based on poetic invention), where the standard of comparison is invented by the poet. As the standard of comparison, presented by the term 'yadi' (i.e., if), is possible in this case, the function of comparing is established and hence there is no (fault of being) too narrow, since the characteristic (of Upamā) is obviously present there. Similarly, nor would it be too narrow to cover the following example of Asambhāvitopamā (Upamā, based on unreal ideas), namely, "Like poison issuing

from the disc of the moon", since, the function of comparing, with the very standard of comparison which is not real, has been established, since it is desired by the poet and since the function of comparing is found to be acknowledged as established according to the desire (of the poet). Nor that the definition is desired to run thus : "Figure Upamā is the function of comparing based on objects which are real." In fact, it is based on how the poet desires to say. This is why, the adjunct 'desired' used in the verse, is significant. In default, the definition would not suit even in the expressions like "The face is like the moon", since, there exists no way except following the
17 desire (of the poet), as, the face, in fact, lacks in the luxuriance of loveliness resting in the moon. The definition would by no means be able to cover the expressions like "Fame white like the moon", since, there exists not even a iota of whiteness in fame. Nor can you say That similarly that in Ananvaya too, accomplishment of the function of comparing with itself is possible owing to the intention of the poet; since, there cannot be any question of intention like that where the poet has made effort to suggest lack of comparability in all respects. It would not be too narrow to cover the expressions like "O my hornet ! why do you hover in vain" etc., since, the function of comparing is accomplished there, because the knowledge of similarity, which is not being obtained, is somehow experienced, although there is an ultimate negation of similarity due to the lack of another substratum of similarity. This is why, the above example is a case of Upamānaluptā (Upamā, where the standard of comparison is elided) owing to the lack of its (i.e. Upamāna's) mention in particular. Consequently, the following definition also deserves consideration :

That is to be called Upamā, where the similarity, which is being described by the poet, does not culminate in its own negation.

Upamā consists in a description of similarity having the function of comparing accomplished.

(Also), Upamā consists in the description of similarity which never culminates in its own negation.

Both the (above) two are but the characteristic of Upamā in general. The definition of Upamā, however, when treated as a figure, is also the same but qualified by the adjuncts 'devoid of any fault' and 'not conveyed by suggestion'. Since, in the cases of Upamā, such as the one relating to the qualified (viśiṣṭopamā), the similies relating to the adjuncts etc., are accessories to the establishment of the simile relating to the qualified which is expressed, they are cases of 'subordinated suggestion leading to the establishment of the expressed idea' ('Vācyasiddhyaṅgarūpaguṇībhūtavyaṅgya') and consequently they are not to be reckoned as figures; hence, not to cover them is not a fault. In the expression like "This is not a lotus but a face", — the figure is not Upamā; since, both the error, as it happens to be suggested by negation, and the simile causing that (Bhrāntimān), are suggested. Still, Dandin, who considered figures like Bhrāntimān etc. too, which are based on nothing but similarity, to be included in Upamā, and used the name 'Tattvākhyānopamā'; but therealso, for reasons stated above, the fault of being too narrow is not involved. This much is enough.

This Upamā is of two types — Complete and Elliptical.

It is complete when the standard of comparison, the subject of comparison, the common property and the word expressing comparison -- these four are mentioned.

It is Elliptical when one, two or three of them are omitted.

In the Complete the common property is somewhere described by conformity, somewhere by the relation of prototype and copy (Vastuprativastubhāva), somewhere by the relation of original and image (Bimbapratibimbabhāva), somewhere by pun, somewhere by a secondary meaning, somewhere by accepting a different compound and somewhere by
18 their combination as far as practicable. But there is no such variety in Elliptical. For, the rule, that the common property must be in conformity, prevails there. But varieties of it from other perspectives, will be noted (later on). The conformity of common property in the Complete is exemplified in the following verse --

> For the right understanding (or the proper knowledge) of words and their meanings, I bow down to Pārvatī and Parameśwara, (the greatest of the gods), who are the parents of the universe and the perpetual relation between whom is as close as the one subsisting between words and their meanings.

The eternal co-existent relation between word and its meaning is proverbial in the Mīmāṃsā rule -- 'autpattikas tu śabdasyārthena sambandaḥ' ('the relation of words with meaning is eternal'). As the separate existence of the moon and the moonbeam cannot be imagined, similar is the case with these Umā and Maheśvara too. This is (also)

well-known. Thus the eternal relation as the common property is here indicated by conformity. Although the deep conjugal love between Umā and Maheśwara and their great majesty are suggested by describing their eternal relation like the relation between the word and its meaning, yet it cannot be deemed as a case of suggestion or a subordinated suggestion. It is not that by the mere appearance of a touch of suggestion, beauty is apprehended here; but it is apprehended also from the appearance of a variety of meaning directly expressed. Hence, various figures of speech are often illustrated without taking into consideration the manifestation of possible Rasa (aesthetic pleasure) and the like or any other suggested figure of speech.

That is to be called Vastuprativastubhāva where the same property is mentioned in two (different) ways on account of their connection with different objects. But that cannot be pure for either in the form of attribute or in the form of a qualified, there must be an intermixture of a Bimbapratibimbabhāva. In fact Bimbapratibimbabhāva consists in twice mentioning of two properties that are (mutually) different per se (but) turned to be identical on account of their mutual semblance. Of them, an example of the Vastuprativastubhāva relating to an attribute, is the following one —

> While going, she, with her eyes having graceful eye-lashes (and) having that face with the neck repeatedly turned backwards and thus resembling a lotus with its stem twisted, planted deep in my heart a side-glance, steeped in nectar and venom.

Here, the identical property of shoulder and lotus-stalk, which are presented as original and image by the words 'valita' and 'āvṛtta', is indicated as related to attribute. Vastuprativastubhāva relating to qualified is seen in the following verse —

> That chaste woman, treambled in fear, was forcibly captured by him, just as a creeper, shaken by wind is grasped by an excessively restless (i.e., always jumping from one spot to another) monkey. 19

Here, the identical property of fear and wind which have attained the Bimbapratibimbabhāva, has been indicated as qualified by the words 'kampita' and 'dhūta'. Bimbapratibimba relation as Pure is seen in the example "pāṇḍyo'yam amsārpitalambahārah" etc. Here, the red sandle-paste and the morning sun, as well as the necklace and the fountain are described in a Bimbapratibimbabhāva. Use of pun is seen in the following verse —

> O, Narasiṃha ! the sovereign ! all your enemies, who have been removed from their positions, have assumed a state equal to the ocean. [ In case of pun — "O, Narasiṃha ! the sovereign ! all your enemies have assumed a state equal to the ocean (which has forgotten) the Lord Accyuta, having his sleep (in it) ].

Use of secondary meaning is seen in the following verse —

> Then, in wonder, eagerly they beheld the prince like the sun with its shooting rays rising from the 'golden-mountain' ('Sumeru'), with their eyes like fully blossomed lotuses.

Here, the blossoming, which is (in fact) an attribute of the flower, is superimposed on the glances (of

the ladies) which happen to be the Upameya here. An example of the use of different compounds is seen in the following verse :-

> As when the earth is visited by autumn with increased brightness of the moon comparable to a face, waters are limpid and thus comparable to a delighted mind, and lilies bloom and thus deserve comparison with opened eyes; similarly, when Śiva came close to the bride with the enhanced brilliance of his moonlike face; his eyes comparable to lilies, expanded with joy, and had his mind delighted and thus comparable to limpid water.

Here, the adjunct 'vivṛddhānanacandrakāntyā' goes with (both) the goddess and the autumn by means of the adoption of different compounds. As regards combination, an example of combination of conformity and the relation of original and image, is seen in the following verse :-

> By the combination of fierce yet amicable virtues he was to his dependents non-assailable as well as accessable as is the ocean owing to its sea-monsters and jewels.

Here, non-assailability and approachability have attained the existence as the common property depending on an idea of a Bimbapratibimbabhāva, observed in the qualities of the king as well as sea-monsters and jewels (of the ocean). The combination of conformity and pun is seen in the following verse —

Oh my son ! as your brother passed away, the great lunar race of ours due to the absence of progeny (in case of Śleṣa — lack of Pārijāta tree) did not shine for long like the garden of Indra, prior to the churning of the ocean.

Here, the idea of 'devoid of beauty' has attained the character of the common property depending on the pun residing in the word 'santāna'. The combination of conformity and secondary meaning is seen in the following verse —

Having seen the army of the king of
Kurus, Uttara, shivering with fear and
20 having perspiration (on his
person), caught hold of the
sword bright like the lightning, like a
lady love embraces (her lover) shivering
in fear and having perspiration.

Here, the idea of the agency of embracing, which has attained a charm here depending on 'shiveringness' as the property in conformity, has been superimposed on 'fear'. The combination of conformity and adoption of ~~another~~ different compound is seen in the following verse —

The quarters having their grey locks in the form of hawk's wings, with their clothes steeped in blood in the form of evening clouds and therefore like women in their menses, with their grey locks of hair comparable to hawk's wings, and garments wet with blood comparable to evening cloud, were not fit to be looked at.

Here, the property in conformity, namely, the state of being unfit to be looked at, attains the exuberence of beauty, depending on the common property attained through the adoption of different compounds in the two adjuncts 'śyenapakṣaparidhūsara' etc. An example of the combination of a 'Vastuprativastubhāva' and a 'Bimbapratibimbabhāva' is seen in the following verse —

> Those (kings) who had suppressed all outward expression of feelings of dissatisfaction under the garb of joy, like clear lakes with alligators concealed within, bade good-bye to the lord of Vidarbhas, and went away having repaid the honour to him under the pretext of marriage gifts.

Here, by the words 'saṃvṛta' and 'gūḍha', one single property (i.e., a common property) residing in anger and 'alligator', assuming the state of a Bimbapratibimbabhāva, has been mentioned and thus it is a case of Bimbapratibimbabhāvavastuprativastubhāva (i.e., Vastuprativastubhāva derived through Bimbapratibimbabhāva). Again, there is an idea of a Vastuprativastu relation residing in the signs of joy and clearness (of water). The combination of pun and a Bimbapratibimbhabhāva is seen in the following verse —

> The princes, being delighted at the fall of Pārtha, shed tears (and thus) pretended to be agrieved, and looked like lakes, with waters on the surface heated in the sun but having cold water inside, emitting vapour.

Here, the beauty of the pun, used in the word 'Bāṣpa', is dependent on a Bimbapratibimbabhāva to be

found in the adjuncts relating to the 'prince' and the 'lakes'. Combination of secondary meaning and a Bimbapratibimbabhāva is seen in the following —

> That lady of violent disposition,
> being assuredby her husband, pronounced
> the two boons that had been promised to
> her, as the earth showered upon by Indra
> (rain) throws out a pair of serpents,
> lurking within its holes.

Here, 'udvamana' i.e., 'vomiting', has been superimposed on both the Upamāna and the Upameya in consideration of the Bimbapratibimba relation between 'āśvāsita' (assured) and 'indrasikta' (showered upon by Indra) as well as 'vara' (boon) and 'uraga' (serpent); since, the primary meaning (of it) is unsuitable in both the cases and also for the fact that in the primary sense the fault of vulgarity is involved. Thus it is said —

> Words like 'niṣṭhyūta' (spitting)
> 'udgīrṇa' (belching) and 'vānta( (vomiting)
> and the like are very pleasing when used
> in their secondary function only; other-
> wise they plunge into vulgarity.

Similarly, other combinations of two factors are to be understood. An example of the combination of (pro-
21 perty in) conformity, a Bimbapratibimbabhāva and an adoption of a different compound is seen in the following verse —

> She, who was destined to become the
> wife of another, with a beautiful navel

resembling a whirlpool, passed by that king, as a river, with its whirpool comparable to a heroine's attractive navel, bent on going to the ocean, passes by a mountain coming across its course.

Here, the expression 'vyatyagāt' ('passed by') is the property in conformity. There is a Bimbapratibimba-bhāva in the expression 'anyavadhūr bhavitrī' (destined to become the wife of another) and 'sāgaragāminī' (bent on going to the ocean) and the adoption of a different compound is to be found in the expression 'āvarta-manojñanābhi'. ~~(whirpool) and 'manojñanābhi' (an attractive navel).~~ They all are combined (in the aforesaid verse). The combination of a property ~~of~~ in conformity, pun and ~~superimposition~~ secondary meaning is seen in the following verse —

> Like Hanumān, (i) having his beautiful locks kissed by the wind-god, (ii) the leader of the army of the delighted husband of Tārā (Sugrīva), and (iii) eagerly looked at by Rāma, separated (from his beloved) — has this spring-time arrived (i) having its pollens of its (flowers) wafted by the breeze, (ii) harbinger of the disc of the bright moon, and (iii) eagerly looked by the afflicted eyes of the women separated (from their lovers).

Here, in the expressions 'āturadṛṣṭivīkṣita' etc., there is the property ~~of~~ in conformity. There is Śleṣa (pun) in the words 'Rāma' etc. There is ~~a superimposition~~ on (acceptance of) secondary meaning in the word 'cumbita' with relation to spring — all these are

combined (here). Similarly, other instances of combinations may be found out by one's own self. There is a peculiarity in the examples relating to the Bimbapratibimbabhāva. Somewhere Bimbapratibimbabhāva between two clearly appearing common properties is drawn on account of their well-known similarity as met in (the example) — 'pāṇḍyo'yam aṃsārpitalambahāra' etc. Somewhere, Bimbapratibimbabhāva between two common properties admitted somehow [is drawn] on account of their similarity being not well-known as met in (the example) — 'tayā vivṛddhānanacandrakāntyā' etc. Here, the commonness between 'autumn' and 'Aparṇā' is by nature not well-known. But the Bimbapratibimbabhāva between (those) two common properties, attained through the adoption of a different compound in the words 'vivṛddhānana' etc., (is admitted). By no means is Bimbapratibimba relation possible unless there is a knowledge of similarity somehow accepted. Now the question arises — how does the Viparītopamā stand in the following verse —

> In this world, as you are endowed with merits — worthless so is your enemy — here the standard of comparison is to be taken as contrary (i.e., it is a case of Viparītopamā).

There is no apprehension of commonness between the state of being endowed with merits and that of being bereft of merits in point of properties mentioned or implied. This is not a fault; since there exists an apprehension of commonness between them in point of (their) implied attributes, viz. the state of being too much, naturality etc.

Otherwise, the commonness expressed by the term 'yathā' would have been baseless. Complete (Upamā) is thus hinted at.

Elliptical (Upamā) is of eight types; such as — Vācakaluptā (where the expressive word is elided), Dharmaluptā (where the property is elided), Upamānaluptā (where
22 the standard of comparison is elided), Vācakopamānaluptā (where the expressive word and the standard of comparison are elided), Dharmopamānaluptā (where the property and standard of comparison are elided), Dharmavācakaluptā (where the property and the expressive word are elided), Vācakopameyaluptā (where the expressive word and the subject of comparion are elided) and Dharmopamānavācakaluptā (where the property, standard of comparison and the expressive word are elided). Examples are being given in seriatim —

> Be it known to thee, that my name is Kumbhodara, as equal to Nikumbha; and I am a servant of the eight-formed God (Śiva), and my back is sanctified by the favour of the placing of his foot-steps (on it) when wishing to mount his bull white as the mount Kailāsa.

Here, in the expression 'kailāsagouram', there is the elision of the expressive word; in the expression 'nikumbhatulyam', elision of property is (met with). Elision of expressive word is always governed by the rules leading to compounds etc. Elision of property is optional; since it can also be said that (he is) equal to Nikumbha in respect of (his) power etc.

> That there was a meeting between him and the thieves and that he was killed by them — alas, all these happened all on a sudden like the coming of the crow and falling of the palm (post hoc ergo propter hoc).

Here, the words 'kāka' and 'tāla' are connected with their respective verbs related to crow and palm in the sphere of vṛtti. Thus 'kākāgamanam iva tālapatanam iva ('as is the coming of the crow so also is the falling of the palm') — gives the form 'kākatālam' and thus it is a case of the compound of the Supsupa type in the sense of 'iva' (similarity) by the indicatory rule 'samāsāc ca tadviṣayāt'. Coming of Devadatta and the arrival of the robbers are the subject of comparison respectively in the (above) two cases. Thus, the meaning that the meeting between Devadatta and the robbers is similar to the coming of the crow and the falling of the palm, is arrived at. Then adding the suffix 'ch' by the rule 'samāsāc ca tadviṣayāt' in the sense of the second 'iva', we get 'kākatālam iva' > 'kākatālīyam'. Thus it follows — as the death of the crow by the falling palm (happened), similarly the murder of Devadatta by the robbers, arrived on the spot, (took place). Thus says the venerable Bhāṣyakāra (author of the Mahā-bhāṣya) — "Thus, there are the two senses of 'iva' as follows — kākāgamanam iva tālapatanam iva kākatālam, kākatālam iva kākatālīyam (as is the coming of the crow so also is the falling of the palm — this gives the form kākatālam. What is similar to kākatālam is kākatālīyam)." This again has been explained by Kaiyaṭa thus —

"Here, the coming of the crow is the standard of comparison for the arrival of Devadatta. (Similarly) the

falling of palm (is the standard of comparison) for the arrival of the robbers on the spot. That the crow is killed by the palm is the standard of comparison for the murder of Devadatta by the robbers. Arrival (of them) all on a sudden on the spot is the common property. That is why the author of the Vrtti says -- "Kākatālīya, then, means a surprising incident occurring all on a sudden." Thus, it is an instance of the elision of the standard of comparison in an Upamā based on the meaning of a suffix, since, the Upamāna, in the form of the combination of the arrival of the crow and the falling of the palm as well as the death of the crow caused by the falling palm, is not mentioned. Considered as an Upamā consisting in the meaning of the compound, it is a case of the elision of the expressive word and the standard of comparison. It is a case of the elision of the common property and the standard of comparison in an Upamā based on the meaning of a suffix, if here, the third quarter is read as 'kim iti brūmo vayam idam' ('how should we name it'). With this very reading considered as an Upamā consisting in the meaning of a compound, it is a case of the elision of common property, standard of comparison and the expressive word. Here (i.e. in the case of a Triluptā Upamā), only the elision of property is optional.

Oh the tiger in the race of Raghu !
23 the duty which you are following
in your profession and religious
austerities, may protect you on all sides.

Here (we find) the elision of property and the expressive word in the compound in the sense -- 'Rāghava i.e. the descendant of Raghu, is like a tiger' -- governed by the rule 'Upamitaṃ vyāghrādibhiḥ sāmānyāprayoge'. Here

the elision of (common) property also, like the elision of the expressive word, is prescribed by the science (of grammar), Since, this compound has been prescribed only where the common property is not mentioned. Elision of common property may also be optional in case of the elision of common property and the expressive word. As for example –

> The mortal being who does not worship that Lord Śiva (lit. the bearer of the lunar digit), to whose worshippers the worldly existence acts as salvation, is a straw-man in (this) world.

Here, the word 'apavargati' is used in the sense 'apavarga iva ācarati' (i.e. acts live salvation) and thus there is the elision of (common) property also like the elision of the expressive word, as, the suffix 'kvip' giving the sense of 'ācāra' ('behaviour') is elided. In the word 'cañcā', the suffix 'kan' is used in the sense 'cañcā' i.e. tṛṇapuruṣa iva ('like a straw-man') governed by the rule 'ive pratikṛtau' and that again is elided by the rule 'lum manuṣye' and thus it is a case of the elision of the expressive word and the elision of the (common) property. In both the cases mention of common property is also possible if this verse is read as –

> The mortal being who does not worship Śambhū, to whose devotees this worldly existence, full of enjoyments, acts like salvation, is nothing but a straw-man as he does no good to himself.

> This person, having his figure more attractive by virtue of its beauty, youth

and charm acts to himself like the Cupid,
in presence of the fawn-eyed girls.

Here, there has been the elision of the expressive word and the subject of comparison. Here, the elision of the subject of comparison, namely, 'svātman' i.e., his own self, is an option to the poet, since the idea that he is acting to himself like the cupid is understood by virtue of his attributes, namely, beauty, youth etc. Such a doubt, that there is the mention of the subject of comparison, namely, the word 'eṣa', cannot be raised, for unless there is a second case-ending of it (i.e., of the word 'eṣa'), that cannot plunge into a subject of comparison in the expression 'puṣpāyudhīyati'. In this very (instance) if the idea, namely, "their eyes are as large as the eyes of a fawn", is considered, there is an eligion of (common) property, standard of comparison and the expressive word, in the word 'hariṇākṣīṇām'. The entire elision is governed by the rule 'saptamyupamānapūrvapadasya' etc. In cases of eligion of (all the) three, the elision of the (common) property may also be optional as is seen in an example of Samāsārthopamā (Upamā, based on a meaning attained through the adoption of a compound) found in the second reading of the verse 'yac corāṇām asya ca' etc. Thus eight variaties of the Elliptical are shown (hereby).

Author of the Kāvyaprakāśikā and others admit six varieties in the Complete whereas in the Elliptical, nineteen
24 varieties by some and twenty by others have been shown on the basis of sub-divisions in the categories of Dharmaluptā (i.e., where the common property is elided) etc. There, the division is made thus — Complete

is divided into two — Śrautī (Explicit) and Ārthī (Implicit). That is Śrautī which comprises words like 'yathā', 'iva', which expresses similarity only. That is Ārthī which comprises words like 'tulya', 'sadṛśa', 'saṃkāśa' and others, capable of indicating object possessing similarity. Both these two varieties may relate to a sentence, a compound or a secondary suffix and thus the complete is of six types. Upamā, with the elision of (common) property also has its divisions like the Complete. But as Śrautī relating to a secondary suffix is not possible, it (i.e. Luptā Śrautī) possesses five varieties. Vācakaluptā (i.e., where the expressive word is elided) is divided in consideration of its occurrence in a 'ṇamul' gerund with object or subject prefixed, in a 'kyac'-derivative with an object or a substratum, in a 'kyaṅ-derivative, in a 'ṇin'-derivative and in a compound — and thus it is of seven types. Upamānaluptā (i.e., where the standard of comparison is elided) being possible in a sentence and a compound has two varieties. Dharmavācakaluptā (i.e., where the common property and the expressive word are elided) is divided into two with regard to its occurrence in a 'kvip'-derivative and in a compound. Dharmopamānaluptā (i.e., where the common property and the standard of comparison are elided) is of two types as it occurs in a sentence and a compound. Upameyavācakaluptā (i.e., where the subject of comparison and the expressive word are elided) is of a single type occurring in a 'kyac' derivative (only). Dharmavācakopamānaluptā (i.e., where the common property, expressive word and the standard of comparison are elided) also is of one type relating to compound only. Thus it is said —

(Upamā) is divided into two — Complete
and Elliptical; that again is divided (into

two) — Explicit and Implicit. The first one of the two occurs in a sentence, in a compound and in a secondary suffix.

When the (common) property is omitted (in the Elliptical) it would be like that (i.e., like the Complete); but in the (Elliptical), the Explicit does not occur in a secondary suffix. There are two varieties in respect of the elision of 'iva' etc., one each in respect of its occurrence in a 'ṇamul' gerund, in a 'kyac' derivative, and in a 'kyaṅ' derivative.

Similarly in a 'ṇini' suffix and in a compound also and (thus) it is stated to be of seven varieties. In consideration of its elision of the standard of comparison, it is divided into two, namely, occurring in a sentence and in a compound.

In case of elision of the (words) like 'iva' and the (common) property also, it is of two types — occurring in a 'kvip' suffix and in a compound. In consideration of its elision of the (common) property and the standard of comparison, it occurs in a sentence and in a compound.

It occurs in a 'kyac' suffix where there is an elision of the two — namely, words like 'iva' and the subject of comparison. It occurs in a compound where there is an elision of words like 'iva', the (common) property and the standard of comparison.

Here we are collecting examples following his opinion —

Salutation to that Śambhu having an appearance as delighted as that of the moon, whose order is borne on the head (lit., carried out) like a garland, by the groups of gods, who after fastening sets free men like animals, whose wealth is like that of the clouds and whom, the agreeable and having similarity with the essence of bliss, the blessed persons worship along with their valuable treasures.

Here, all the six varieties of Complete are exemplified. Of these, in the first line we find Explicit occurr-
25 ing in a sentence; in the second line we find the Explicit occurring in a compound, since, the expression 'paśūn iva' is considered a compound word governed by a statement of the author of the Vārtikas, viz., 'ivena nityasamāso vibhaktyalopaḥ pūrvapadaprakṛtisvaratvam ca'. In the third line we find the Explicit occurring in a secondary suffix; since, in the expression 'abhravat' the suffix 'vati' in the sense of 'iva' ('like') is applied after the Ṣaṣṭhīsamāsa, governed by the rule 'tatra tasyeva'. In the expression 'hṛdayaṃ śevadhinā samaṃ hṛdi bhajanti' we find the Implicit occurring in a sentence. In the expression 'ānandasāropamam' we find the Implicit occurring in a compound. The adjunct 'hṛdyam' is required here also; otherwise it would be considered an Upamā with the common property elided and not a Complete one. In the expression 'śaśivat' we find the Implicit in a secondary suffix, since, the suffix 'vati' appearing there has been added in the sense of 'tulya' (similar) governed by the rule 'tena tulyaṃ kriyā ced vatiḥ'.

This sovereign of gods, whose figure is like

the new nectar, of whom the lusture of neck is like that of an Indranīla gem, whose locks of hair bear close resemblance to lightning, human skulls on whose person is like gold, whose feet bear semblance with a lotus, may rest in my heart.

Here all the five varieties of the simile with the elision of common property are exemplified. Of these, the expression 'mūrtir yathā navasudhā' relates a sentence. 'Balabhin maṇīva kaṇṭhaprabhā' is Explicit relating to Compound. Had in both the cases a verb like 'bhāti' (shining) been mentioned, it would not remain a case of elision of common property and hence the same has not been mentioned. Explicit however, with the elision of common property is not possible in the secondary suffix, since, the suffix 'vati' used in the sense of 'iva' (like) added either to a word in sixth case-ending or a seventh case-ending, does not suit well in its syntactical relation without the mention of the (common) property. Nor can it be said that there exists non-expectancy of the secondary suffix added in the sense of 'iva' under the heading 'ive pratikṛtau' even without the mention of the (common) property, since, uses such as 'kuśāgrīyā buddhiḥ' (penetrating intellect like the sharp point of a kuśa grass), 'śaileyam dadhi' (curd with mountainous hardness), 'pauṇḍarīkaṃ mukham' (face with whiteness of a white lotus) are to be found and thus Explicit with the elision of (common) property in a secondary suffix can be exemplified. Because, suffixes mentioned under the heading 'ive pratikṛtau' are prescribed to be used in the sense of 'similar' only. Otherwise, as in examples 'kuśāgrīyā buddhiḥ' etc., because of the lack of a sense of culmination

in an object qualified by similarity, there would be a lack of common substratum of the Upameya (with the Upamāna), whereas they are actually found to be referring to a common substratum, even the statement of similarity would culminate in the idea of a 'similar'(object); and thus the mention of 'iva' in the sūtra ('ive pratikṛtau') is not inconsistent. In the three lines beginning with 'susadṛśaś ca', there are Implicit (similes) in a sentence, in a

26 compound and in a secondary suffix respectively. The suffix 'deśya' although prescribed in the sense 'falling a little short of (something)' in the expression 'abjadeśyam', is (at times) used in the sense of similarity and that again culminates in a sense of a 'similar (object)' as it exists in a common substratum. Now the question arises — justified that it is Implicit where words like 'sadṛśa' are in use, since, it culminates in an object qualified by similarity; but is it Explicit or Implicit where words like 'sādṛśya' are used ? For example, in the following verse and the like, we say, it is Explicit.

> They beheld a (marked) similarity of each
> other's eyes in the pair of antelopes which
> had withdrawn to a little distance from the
> road and had fixed their eyes on the chariot.

The reason is this : Here, though by the stem, to which a secondary suffix has been added, an idea culminating in a qualified object is expressed, it is similarity, expressed by the suffix, which is predominant (in the entire derivative), is construed with the meaning of the (entire) sentence.

> I worship him — having seen whom the God
> of love is destroyed instantly as an insect

is destroyed on seeing a lamp, who acts like a harem in his heart who worships him excessively and who very soon acts to him like the Kumāra (i.e., Skanda), who acts like the main pillar in the construction in the form of the three worlds, seated to the left, whom, a heavenly creeper, having the voice like that of a cuckoo and blue complexion of a kuvalaya (i.e. a blue-lotus) take resort to.

Here, all the seven varieties of the elision of expressive word are shown. Here, (Upamā with) the expressive word elided, is to be noted in the following order — in the 'ṇamul' gerund prefixed by an object in the expression 'dīpadarśam' used in the sense of 'like seeing a lamp'; in the 'ṇamul' gerund prefixed by a subject in the expression 'kīṭanāśamnaṣṭa' used in the sense of 'destroyed like an insect'; in the 'kyac' derivative denoting a substratum in the expression 'antaḥpurīyati' used in the sense of 'acts like a harem in his heart'; in the 'kyac' derivative prefixed by an object (in the expression 'kumārīyati') used in the sense of 'acts like kumāra i.e. Skanda'; in the 'kyaṅ' derivative prefixed by a subject in the expression 'mūlastambhāyate' used in the sense of 'acts like the main pillar in the construction of the three worlds'; in the 'ṇini' suffix in the expression 'kokilālāpinī' used in the sense of 'speaking in the voice of a cuckoo'; in the compound in the expression 'kuvalayaśyāmalā' used in the sense of 'having a complexion blue like a kuvalaya (i.e. a blue-lotus)'.

May my mind, giving up other fickleness, perform the worship to the Lord Purāri (i.e.

Śiva), pleasing and benevolent like whom is not seen and nothing like whom is heard of.

Here, both the two types of (Upamā with) the elision of standard of comparison are exemplified -- (one) in a compound to be found in the word 'yatsamam' and (the other) in a sentence to be found in the expression 'yena sadṛśam'.

Alas ! in vain is my mind wandering while Maheśvara is there. Is anyone equal to him heard of or is anyone equal to him remembered? Let it ever act like a black-bee to the couple of his lotus-like feet and let it act like a Cakora-bird calmly to his face possessing the glow of the moon.

Here, remaining six types of (Upamā with) elision have also been exemplified. Thus, in the second quarter, two varieties, namely, elision of (common) property and the standard of comparison occurring in a sentence and a compound, in the third quarter (another) two varieties,
27 namely, the elision of (common) property and the expressive occurring in a 'kvip'-derivative and a compound, the expression 'cakorīkīyatu' as an example of the elision of the expressive and the subject of comparison, the expression 'śaśiprabhe' as a case of the elision of (common) property, standard of comparison and the expressive -- are to be considered in seriatim.

Such a division of the Complete and the Elliptical in respect of their occurrence in a sentence, a compound and a particular suffix is for exhibiting the knowledge and skilfulness of grammar only and does not deserve to be essentially acquainted with so far as the science of poetics is concerned, nor is this division of elisions

exhaustive. Thus, (similes with) the elision of (common) property, occurring in a sentence, a compound and a secondary suffix are exemplified; but this may be found in reduplication also as in the expression 'paṭupaṭur devadattaḥ' (Devadatta is almost an expert), since, the reduplication is prescribed here in the sense of similarity, governed by the rule 'prakāre guṇavacanasya'. It means 'resembling (i.e. almost) an expert'. One, who acts like an expert although being unacquainted with scriptures etc., — is called a 'paṭupaṭu'. It is not a case of the Upamā with elision of (common) property in a sentence, since, it has been established as a unified word for its treatment like a compound, governed by the rule 'karmadhārayavad uttarapadeṣu'. Hence it cannot be an (Upamā with) elision of (common) property in a compound also. Some have established six varieties of (Upamā with) elision of the expressive without considering (its occurrence with the suffix) 'ṇini'. Including (its occurrence with the suffix) 'ṇini', others have admitted its seven varieties. It's occurrence with the suffix 'kvip' and secondary suffixes also are found as in the following verse —

> The mortal being who does not worship
> Śambhu, to whose devotees this worldly
> existence, full of enjoyments, acts like
> salvation, is nothing but a straw-man as
> he does no good to himself.

This has been explained beforehand. Upamā, with the standard of comparison elided, occurring in a sentence and a compound also has been exemplified. It is found in a secondary suffix also as noticed in — 'Upanatametad akasmād āsīd vata kākatālīyam' ('Alas ! all these happened

all on a sudden like the coming of the crow and falling of the palm'). (Upamā) with the expressive and standard of comparison elided, as such has not been exemplified. That also is found in the compound standing as the basic word of (the compound) Kākatālīyam. Even, (Upamā) with the (common) property and standard of comparison elided, occurring in a secondary suffix, is exemplified in the word 'kākatālīyam'. (Upamā) with the (common) property and the expressive elided, is seen in a secondary suffix also as in a 'kvip' derivative and a compound. It has been exemplified beforehand in the hemistich "taṃ jagatyabhajan marttyaś cañcā candrakalādharam" (i.e. 'the mortal being, who does not worship that Śiva, lit., bearer of the lunar digits, is a straw-man in this world'). Thus, this is only an indication to the division of Elliptical made by the old (critics) and not an exhaustive division. Other divisions of Upamā as given in the works like kāvyāloka etc., are all to be gathered from those books concerned only. Heretoo, a few have been shown in the section on
28 the consideration of the definition. We shall show some (other) divisions of its in the section on Rūpaka (Metaphor).

Again, this Upamā is broadly threefold; somewhere it culminates only in its own charmingness, as in the example like — 'sa cchinnamūlaḥ kṣatajena reṇuḥ'; somewhere it establishes the said object as in 'anantaratna-prabhavasya' etc., or in the verse —

> The crime of betrayal on the part of a villain which enrages a hero, brings about his own destruction just as the sound, produced by the uprooting of forest trees,

> which disturbs the lion's sleep brings about the death of the elephant.

Somewhere it has the suggested sense predominant. As suggested sense is of three varieties, namely, (bare) idea, figure of speech and aesthetic taste (Rasa), it is of three varieties. Of these, an example of the suggestion of idea is the following verse —

> In whose hand the sword was seen by the heroes in battle, resembling the wrath-red glances of the goddess Kālī, since it shone red through the thick blood on being struck against the hard surface of the forehead of redolent elephants blinded with intoxication.

Here, by describing the similarity of the sword with the glances of the angry goddess Kālī, the idea, that the entire enemy force would be destroyed within a moment is suggested. An example of the suggestion of a figure of speech is the following verse —

> O King ! as your fame, as white as the rays of the moon, spread forth, the sky (lit. the abode of Lord Viṣṇu) looks like a hornet on a white-lotus.

Here, as by the figure Upamā, the sense of abundance of fame like white-lotuses and the scantiness of the sky like hornets, is conveyed, the figure Adhika (Exceeding) which is characterised by dissimilarity between an 'āśraya' (substratum) and an 'āśrayin'(the contained), is suggested. An example of emergence of aesthetic taste (i.e. suggestion of Rasa) is exemplified in the example beginning with 'vāgarthāviva'.

Somewhere all the three varieties of suggestion are found in the same place. For example the following verse may be cited.

> See, the crane on a lotus-leaf is seen here, like an oyster-shell placed on a vessel made of yellow pearls."

To indicate the rendezvous, this expression of a wise lady love, who, from a gesture, has come to know the intention of her secret lover, who wants to ask but has
29 not actually asked in public — 'what should be our rendezvous' has been used. Here, as by narrating similarity between the crane seated on a lotus-leaf with an oyster-shell placed on an emeraled vessel, its (i.e., the crane's) throblessness is understood, confidence (on the part of the lady-love) is suggested. Thereby, solitariness of that place (of appointment) is suggested and thus it is a case of Vastudhvani. Hence, the meaning — 'this very place is our rendezvous' is expressed; therefore, this is a case of the suggestion of the figure Sūkṣma (subtle) consisting in the presentation of a subtle idea as marked here. Thus, as the description is in conformity with their intention, sentiment of love pertaining to each other is suggested and hence it is a case of Rasadhvani.

That the suggestion of Rasa and the like has no noticeable sequence — is well-known; then how its suggestion through resonance (as it were) is admitted here ? Such an objection cannot be raised. There it is 'asaṃlakṣyakrama' where the development of aesthetic taste quickly occurs owing to the function of Vibhāva (i.e., the objective condition of producing an emotion), Anubhāva (i.e., the bodily expression by which the emotion is

expressed) etc.; elsewhere, even the suggestion of the Rasa and the like appear in noticeable sequence. Thus it has been said by the venerable Abhinavagupta — "Though the idea, such as Rasa and Bhāva are always suggested and never expressed, yet all these do not fall under the purview of suggestion which has no noticeable sequence." This is why, even Dhvanikāra (author of the Dhvanikārikās) admitted suggestion through resonance of the Sañcāribhāva (the transient sentiment) namely, bashfulness, in the following verse —

> While the heavenly saint was speaking thus,
> Pārvatī, who was then close to her father,
> with her face bent down, began counting
> the petals of a lotus, which she held as a
> play-thing (in her hand).

Now in the context of suggestion from the Upamā, varieties of the suggestion of Upamā are being shown. Of these, the suggestion of Upamā based on the power of words is seen in the following verse —

> That a few blossom and a few not while the
> moon pours out a heap of excessively white
> rays profusely on flowers, is due to their
> (particular) nature only. (or, that a few
> acquire knowledge and a few not while the
> master of arts spreads a heap of clear
> knowledge profusely to students, is due to
> their respective nature only.)

Here, in this very example, figure Upamā is suggested, since, the non-contextual is considered an Upamāna to the contextual in the following sense — the distinction

in (a group of) students receiving their learning from the same preceptor, of whom a few becoming strong and quick in answers while others not, is not due to any speciality in teaching applied to those students by the preceptor who teaches but is due to their respective character. As this distinction, namely, a few (of the flowers) blossom but others not while the moon is pouring out its heap of rays uniformly on all flowers, is due to the nature of the particular flower only and not caused by the difference in rays of the moon, similarly the distinction, namely, knowledge and ignorance in them (i.e. the students) while the preceptor delivers his speech uniformly to all students, is due to their particular nature only. Thus, owing to the
30 impossibility of replacement by synonymous like 'vāk' for punning words 'go', 'sumanas' and 'kalānidhi', it is a suggestion through resonance based on the power of words.

Suggestion of Upamā by a bare idea based on the power of meaning is seen in the following —

> O wind ! blow you fpom that place where
> resides my beloved (at present) and having
> touched her touch me also please. Contact
> of my person with you is tantamount to the
> contact of glances with the moon.

Here, similarity of Sītā's face with the moon is suggested through the power of meaning by the (statement) — 'candre dṛṣṭisamāgamaḥ' i.e., contact of glances with the moon. Suggestion of Upamā by a figure of speech is seen in the following —

> (Oh king) ! by whom at that time, while
> smashing the enemy, you, with a blow of

of barbed dart fallen on your forehead (and) the front part (of the body) redenned with the swallen flow of blood, were looked at in battle, astonishment of their's with regard to Śiva (lit. enemy of the demon Pura), glittering with the burden of a multitude of flames of fire which emitted from his (third) eye and which originated for burning the irresistible body of Kāma, happened to meet cessation.

Here, the figure of speech is Viśeṣa (Extraordinary) consisting in doing something not really possible while something else is aimed at. As it has been described that while seeing you in the said form, he beheld Lord Puraripu (i.e. Śiva) qualified by the adjuncts as said (above), and as doing (something) which means action in general, applies to the action of seeing also, this idea, though not expressed, is suggested because of the description of cessation of astonishment. Thus, the simile viz. then you remained at that time like Śiva of that description, has been suggested (here). Upamā is thus hinted at with example.

Now, blemishes of the figure Upamā are being considered, -- they say; six are its blemishes; namely, deficiency, surpassingness, difference in gender, difference in number, lacking in similarity and impossibility. Of these, that is called 'Deficiency' where the standard of comparison is inferior to the subject of comparison. 'Surpassingness' consists in superiority. Each of both these two are divided into three in respect of class, evidence and attribute. Of these, 'Deficiency'

and 'Surpassingness' in respect of class and evidence are exemplified below —

> A great adventure has been performed by you as by Caṇḍālas.
>
> This sun shines like a spark of fire.
>
> This Cakravāka bird, seated on the lotus-seat, looks beautiful, — just like the revered Creator going to create the people at the beginning of the cycle.
>
> Your navel is like the nether world,
> 31 breasts like mountains, and
> this staff-like braid of hair
> is like the stream of the Kālindī.

Here, by the Upamānas Caṇḍāla etc., the intended meaning has become too much distorted and thus 'Deficiency' and 'Surpassingness' culminate in impropriety in meaning. 'Deficiency' and 'Surpassingness' in respect of property are two blemishes, namely, less or redundant use of words. For example —

> That sage, marked with a girdle of Muñja grass and wearing a garment made of the skin of a black-antelope, shone like the sun, embraced by a piece of dark cloud.
>
> That Kṛṣṇa, whose garment was yellow and who had taken his bow, assumed a form attractive and (yet) awful, like a cloud, possessed of lightning and rainbow, connected with the moon at night.

Here, in the first example, as the characterising property, namely, the lightning as an image of the girdle of Muñja-grass, is not mentioned with the Upamāna, there is 'Deficiency'. In the second example, since conch-shell etc., as belonging to Upameya are not mentioned, inclusion of the moon becomes redundant and thus it is a case of 'Surpassingness'. An example of the difference in gender and number is seen in the following —

> Oh lord ! an object, precious like the Cintāmaṇi gem (Philosopher's stone), even placed on palm, slips off out of ill luck, just as a woman of a noble-birth [ultimately widowed] passes her days by feeding on pure barley-meal.

These two (blemishes) are included inthe category of 'Break of Order'. How ? The state of slipping down etc., cannot be the common property here; since it lacks in syntactical relation owing to the fact that there only it (i.e., the common property) may be connected where there exists a semblance of gender and number between the Upamāna and the Upameya. Upamāna or Upameya assumes the respective status only when they are qualified by the given adjuncts. But Upamā is completed with a different property suggested. Thus, as out of the Upamāna and the Upameya one is connected with an adjunct and the other not — it involves (the blemish) — 'Viśeṣaṇaprakramabhaṅga' ('Break of Order with regard to Adjunct').

Some take even the difference in tense, person and the meanings of verbal moods etc., as a blemish. For example —

> In order to avert this (calumny) I will

abandon the daughter of the king of Videha, being regardless of the consideration that the birth of a child is near at hand, as formerly I did the ocean - girded earth at my father's command.

Here, the syntactical relation is 'samudranemim atyajam' ('I abandoned the earth') and not 'tyakṣyāmi' ('I shall abandon'). An example of the difference in person is the following —

Oh lord of people, like a Nīvāra plant — left with its stem — its produce of crops having been appropriated by foresters, — you are shining in bodily appearance only, with wealth given away to worthy recepients.

With Nīvāra (the third person verbal form) 'ābhāti' may be connected and not 'ābhāsi'. An example of the difference in (meanings like) command etc., is seen in the following —

To you that have attained all fortunes, any other benediction would be a repeation. May you obtain a son praiseworthy and befitting your excellences as your father obtained you.

The syntectical relation is 'bhavantam alabhata' and not 'labhasva', meaning benediction. In Upamā, the two blemishes, namely, 'Asādṛśya' (Lack of Similarity) and 'Asambhava' (Impossibility) culminate in a blemish entitled 'Anucitārthatā' (Impropriety of Meaning). An example of 'Lack of Similarity' is the following —

I compose a moon-like poem, which has well-
displayed senses resembling rays.

Similarity of poetry with the moon is not well-known. Had the similarity between the meanings and the rays been well-known, similarity between poetry and the moon, although not well-known, could have been imagined by considering their relation as the prototype and its copy. But that also does not exist. Or for example, the verse —

This Vindhya mountain with its joyous
fountains (flowing) in dense groves,
resembles the Lord (Śiva) with spreading
flames of fire, emitting from the eye of his
forehead.

An example of 'Impossibility' is the following one —

Burning arrows fell as it were from his
mouth which was at the middle of the curve
of his bow, like fiercely burning showers
of water from the sun, occupying the
middle of the day and possessed of a halo.

Since the burning showers of water falling from the orb of the sun is not possible, (it is a case of) 'Impossibility'.

There are some who consider the absence of currency of the Upamāna as a separate blemish. For example —

The face of the girl, with (her) eyes
smeared with tears, looks like a blue-lotus
of the river with its petals wet with frost.

Here the blemish is the very non-familiarity of the Utpala as a standard of comparison to face although drawing similarity between the eyes smeared with tears and petals wet with frost, is possible by a relation of prototype and its copy.

Now exceptions to these blemishes are being shown. Deficiency and Surpassingness by 'jāti' (class) and 'pramāṇa' (evidence) are not considered blemishes in the case of uses based on literary convention. For example —

> The moon is equal to your face (in charmingness) and your face is similar to the moon. The molecule of two atoms is like the waist (of yours) and the waist resembles the molecule of two atoms.

There is no impropriety here, because of its literary convention. 'Deficiency' and 'Surpassingness' with regard to a property are not considered blemishes if the same is required for a different contextual purpose for the reason
33 that the mention of additional properties of the Upameya or the Upamāna is required for drawing many an Upamā based on each of the properties or for establishing the state of a common property or for achieving a speciality in the nature of the object endowed with a property or for accepting some other means. For example —

> She, wearing a linen garment and holding a mirror, appeared excessively fresh every moment like the shore of the ocean of milk having heaps of foam and the autumnal night with abundant moonbeams.

Here, (no blemish is considered) since the mention

of additional adjuncts belonging to the Upameya is meant for several Upamās based on each of the adjuncts.

> The shore of the ocean of the milk, marked with heaps of foams and the autumn night with abundance of moonbeams imitated her who wore a linen garment and held a mirror with glowing transperance.

In this reading of the same verse, mention of many properties belonging to the Upamāna is for drawing a couple of Upamās based on each of the properties and as such surpassingness of the Upamāna with regard to properties, is not a blemish.

> Thus requested by the king, the sage remained still for a moment with his eyes closed in deep meditation like a large lake in which the fish are asleep.

Here, the adjunct 'vijñāpita' ('requested') is for establishing the common property with regard to the expression 'dhyānastimitalocana' ('eyes closed in deep meditation') and hence the deficiency (noticed in the verse) is not a blemish.

> Then catching the tawning sound of their bow-string Tāḍakā whose complexion resembled the appearance of a night of the dark-fortnight and whose ear-rings made of human skulls were dangling, appeared before them like a thick row of clounds interpersed with flocks of cranes.

Here, the adjunct 'nibiḍā' ('thick') is for establishing a common property (by imposing) 'bahulakṣapācchavi'

('complexion resembling a night of the dark fortnight') on 'kālikā' ('rows of clouds') and thus the surpassingness (noticed in the verse) is not a blemish.

> Kumudvatī got from the decendant of
> kakutstha (i.e., Kuśa) a son named Atithi,
> as intellectual faculties get clearness
> from the last quarter of the night.

Here, the adjunct 'atithim nāma' ('named Atithi') is for achieving a speciality in the nature of the object endowed with property i.e., 'putra' and hence the ~~sur-passingness~~ deficiency (noticed in the verse) is not a blemish.

> As the water from the heaven which has
> but originally one taste, obtains a
> diversity of flavour in different parts
> of the countries, so you who are immut-
> able, assume different conditions when
> connected with different qualities (of
> sattvaḥ, rajas and tamaḥ).

Here, the adjunct 'divyam' (i.e., heavenly) is for understanding a particularity of the object endowed with property and hence, the surpassingness (here) is not a blemish. Similarly, in other function of embellishment
34 and the like too related to the contextual matter, (the same) is to be considered. **Thus, when the counter-adjuncts (exactly corresponding) to the adjuncts of the Upamāna and Upamaya are not mentioned, only then deficiency and surpassingness are blemishes, - provided that this has got no utility in the presentation of the contextual, which is different (from the non-contextual) and provided that there is no possibility of the establishment of a common property by this (absence of the mention of the counter- ~~adjust~~ adjuncts) even if there be a relation of the original and its image.**

Surpassingness turns to be a Guna(quality) when establishment of commonness (in the adjuncts) is achieved even though the adjuncts are used in confirmity with some other purposes or are supported. As for example, in the verse beginning with 'jyāninādam abhigṛhnatī', -- the adjunct of Upameya, namely, 'catching the twaning sound of the bow-string' is applied for avoiding the impropriety arising out of killing a woman (by way of indicating that) Tāḍaka herself, having appeared and being desirous of killing, attacked (him) at first (and consequently) was killed by Rāma. (Here) also ('surpassingness' noticed in the) commonness with regard to the Upamāna (has been turned into a Guṇa) since, by the figure Atiśayokti, the adjunct relating to that (Tāḍaka), is supplied to the roaring Kālikā also. Similarly, in the verse (beginning with) 'Nṛpaṃ tam āvarta' although the expression 'anyavadhūr bhavitrī' means 'swerving (to another), the counter-adjunct to that, namely, 'sāgaragāminī' has been mentioned.

Where the word, expressive of commonness, does not attain any change in its character even in the divergence of gender and number — that is not a blemish there; since, it may be connected with the both. For example, (we may quote the following) — "bhīmakāntair nṛpaguṇaiḥ". (An example of the divergence in number not considered as a blemish, is the following one) —

> Like her gestures, her dress, not common with other women and filled with sweetness, attained the highest splendour.

Divergence in gender and number is seen in the usages of great poets inspite of the question of change in

character of the word, expressive of commonness. For example, the following verses and the like may be considered —

A good man even though an enemy was accepted
by him as a medicine is by a sick person,
and a wicked man even though dear was
rejected by him like a finger bitten by a
cobra.

The moon decays as does the sea after
having attained growth; but he was one
whose growth was like that of theirs and
not decaying like them.

There are numerous examples of the divergence of tense etc. Vāmana says — "Divergence of gender etc. noticed in such cases is not a blemish since it is current in the popular usages." (In fact), in the injunction of quality (Guṇa) or blemish — feeling of the connoisseur is the (only) proof. This is why Daṇḍin says —

Where wise men are not displeased thereby,
35 difference in gender or number
or inferiority or superiority
(in the comparison) is not sufficient for
~~the consideration of~~ spoiling a Simile.

This eunuch walks like a woman; this
woman talks like a man; this person is dear
to me like vital breaths; learning has been
acquired by me as if it were wealth.

O, protector of the earth, like you
shines the king of gods. The king on

account of his glory is able to ascend to the (high) rank of the sun.

Things like this never lose in charm. But there is certainly somewhat of displeasure (caused) to those who know the language, by such statements as there.

The moon is white like a lady swan; the sky is clear like the lakes; the servant is devoted like a dog to his master, the glow-worm shines like the sun.

Such cases (of the above-mentioned types) are given exemption (from the list of blemishes) by the wise; the cause behind it is to be considered thereof (respectively).

Lacking in similarity is not considered a blemish if current in the circle of poets as noticed in the following and the like — "glorious deeds of yours are white like the moon (beams). Impossibility, with regard to Upamāna, if desired to express impossibility relating to the Upameya, is not considered a blemish. As for example, in the following verse and the like — "like poison emitting from the disc of the moon". Lacking in familiarity is not a blemish where the common property consists of a pun or in other cases too as in an Upamā with its Upamāna, which (although) being an imagination (of the poet only) delights the hearts of connoisseurs as noticed in the following and the like —

(She) shines smilingly like a poet's intellect having many disputes, like the

morning time with the couple of Cakravākas
united, like the image of Lord Hara with
eyes having smokeless fire. (While pun
is considered) — "Cakravandha type of
literature (or poetry), well-composed and
deserving much endeavour shines glowingly
like the intellect.......").

The orange vieing with the chin of a drunken
barbarian (Hūṇa) just shaven.

Similarly, experts should consider the other varieties of exemption also in respect of blemish.

Here ends the section on Upamā in the Citramīmāṃsā.

-: oOo :-

Upameyopamā (Reciprocal Comparison) is now being described.

If the two objects attain the state of
Upamāna and Upameya by rotation — it is
called Upameyopamā, (Reciprocal Comparison).
This is said to be of two varieties.

If it is said — that is called Upameyopamā if something relating to two be described, then it will be too wide a definition with regard to Tulyayogitā. Since, (as in the following), —

In that excessively hot times of summer two
36 things became greatly agreeable to the
people — viz. that king and the moon, —
both standing in their rise — the one, the
service of whose feet was able to remove

misery, the other, the enjoyment of whose rays was able to remove heat (caused by summer).

Connections of the two, namely, the king and the moon, with a single property have been described simultaneously. Hence, 'paryāyeṇa' ('by rotation') has been mentioned.

Still, with regard to the following verse —

on account of the flow of ichor of elephants and the strokes of hoofs of horses of that (leader), the dust on the road was turned into mud excessively and mud also into dust.

it would be found too wide a definition, since, turning of dust and mud into mud and dust has been described there by rotation. Hence, 'upamānopameyatvam' i.e., attaining the state of Upamāna and Upameya, has been mentioned. Even if it is said that the description of the attainment of the state of Upamāna and Upameya of the two, is the Upameyopamā, (then also) it will be found too wide a definition with regard to a simile with its point of similarity resting in both, as noticed in the following — "Then, both the advent of dawn and the departure (of Krishna), associated with the ladies, afflicted with the pangs of separation, were considered equal to the other." Nor can it be said that in both the two the state of Upameya only as the substratum of similarity has been established there (and) not the state of Upamāna as the counter-entity of similarity and hence (fault of being) too wide a definition is not involved, since, the state of Upamāna of those two with each other can be known by implication although not established by utterance. For, it is not desired in the definition that the state of Upamāna and Upameya should

be expressed, as the question of non-inclusion of suggested Upameyopamā would arise. Hence is said, — 'by rotation'. Even then, as in the following example of Rasanopamā (Chain of Similes) viz. "[His] intellect is like (his) words, his efforts are like (his) intellect", intellect and effort have assumed the state of Upamāna and Upameya by rotation — it is intended that in order to avoid the fault of being too wide a definition here, the state of Upameya should relate to that by rotation to which the state of Upamāna relates.

This is said to be of two varieites. (This) two-fold division is admitted in consideration of commonness in property and the relation of a prototype and copy. The two examples are given below in order —

> Your face, fragrant, pleasing to the eyes and crimson by virtue of the intoxication caused by liquor, is like the lotus; and the lotus [also fragrant, pleasing to the eyes and like intoxicating liquor] is like your face.

> Where lakes, with their faces in the form of beautiful lotuses, look like beautiful women, and the charming women with their faces like beautiful lotuses look like the lakes.

Here it (i.e. the above nemtioned definition) is being examined — the definition is too narrow to cover the Yugapadupameyopamā (Simultaneous Reciprocal Comparison) illustrated earlier with — "tad valgunā yugapad unmisitena tāvat". Such a doubt cannot raise that this

is not an example of Upameyopamā but a mere Upamā resting on both the sides; since, by the expression 'parasparatulām'
37 the state of being counter-entity of both is being established and thus the meaning of the components of the word Upameyopamā remains in tact (here). The reason is also that by virtue of conveying through utterance the state of being counter-entities to each other though otherwise established by implication, the result viz. the exclusion of a third similar one is achieved. Moreover, it would be too-wide a definition with regard to Parasparopamā illustrated earlier with "rajobhiḥ syandanodbhūtaiḥ". Nor can one admit Upameyopamā even there because of the lack of the cognition of the exclusion of a third similar object and also for the inconsistency involved in (its) division by the statement — "dvividhaiṣā prakīrtitā" i.e., it is of two varieties. Neither the commonness in property nor the relation of a prototype and copy is found here; since, in the similarity of the sky with the surface of the earth, the state of being covered with dust is the common property; whereas a relation of original and its image, met in the elephants and clouds lies in the simile of the earth with the sky and thus the case in question is very much different from the aforesaid one and hence, even the result, namely, the exclusion of a third similar object is not accomplished. Since, that there is not a third similar object similar to these two in this regard results where the mutual similarity, ~~basing~~ which is based on one property is being described. When the similarity of something with something else is described, the similarity of the later with the former is accessible by implication; still, if that be described by utterance that aims at excluding a third similar object and this is ~~not possible in the case of the difference of property also~~

the very root of the aforesaid result. This is not possible in the case of the difference of property also as in the case of commonness of property. Because, it lacks in establishment of implied similarity of the surface of the earth with the elephants having figures like clouds by the description of the similarity of the sky covered with dust with the earth.

Moreover, it would be found too-wide a definition with regard to the following example of Upamā, based on the relation of an original and its image but involving separate properties —

> As that father became one who was rightly possessed of an excellent son on account of that prince who was entirely devoted to win his favour, so that son too became one who should rightly be considered to have had an excellent father on account of that royal father who was kind to his son.

Here, both the son and the father possess the property so as to stand as Upameya and Upamāna. Of them both are mentioned as belonging to the category of common properties, nemely, the state of 'having a father' and 'having a son' in turns. The property establishing commonness in them in the form of a relation of an original and its image is the praiseworthiness denoted by the suffixes 'matup' and 'ini'. Obviously, those two suffixes are applied here to denote praise, since, it is useless to mention the mere relation 'having a father owing to the father'. Thus that the state of having a good father and the state of having a good son with regard

to the son and the father (respectively) are the common properties in consideration of their relation of a prototype and its copy intermingled with a relation of an object and its image — is hereby reached. 'adhikavatsalena' and 'samārādhanatatpareṇa' are the adjuncts

38 establishing (that) praiseworthiness of those two, viz., father and the son. Thus, the same father who is the Upamāna to (his) son in a 'Dharmyupamā' ('Simile between substances') stands as the subject of comparison in the mention of the relation of an original and its image establishing that (point of similarity) — and thus the application of the definition is clear. Still, it is not a case of Upameyopamā. The reason is this : In the simile between the substances, namely, the son and the father; the state of having a praiseworthy father and the state of having a praiseworthy son is the common property drawn through a relation of a prototype and its copy intermingled with a relation of an object and its image. Again, praiseworthiness arising out of excellence in affection and in filial duty of the father and the son (respectively), set in the side of the property, is the common property pertaining to both — and thus, since it bears conformity with the previous example and since the (idea of) exclusion of a third similar one is not attained although the idea that the son also is praiseworthy for (his) filial duty as the father is praiseworthy for (his) affection towards off-spring is attained through Samuccayopamā. Nor can it be said that the fault of being too wide a definition would be checked here by the very adjunct 'paryāya', since it lacks in the couple of orders connected with a couple of occurrences of the word 'iva' or the like. There is simile between the son and the father existing in the

side of expression and another simile between the father and the son in the side of suggestion and thus there exists two orders. Expressiveness of the two orders is not intended here so as to check the fault of being too wide a definition due to the lack of two orders connected with a couple of occurrences of the word 'iva'. If that be the case, it has been maintained, that there would be no generalisation with the suggested Upameyopamā. Nor can it be said that simile exists in the substance ('dharmins') only; whereas as regards the properties, there appears an identity only and no simile aimed at establishing a commonness between the Upamāna and the Upameya. The reason is this : in the following example and the like, viz.,

> I, like a honey-bee, having again and again
> enjoyed the face, which resembled a lotus,
> of the lady with slender limbs, who was
> like a lotus-bed, was satisfied.

even the generalisation arising out of similarity in (two) properties has been admitted as leading to the Upamā because simile is noticed, for example, between the lady having slender limbs and the lotus-bed and the like having attained the relationof an original and its image. Hence, the question of being too wide a definition seems to be irresistible there. Thus it is noticed that this definition is unsuitable. (What) we say here (is this) :

> That is known as Upameyopamā where (the
> description of) mutual similarity (between
> the Upamāna and the Umapeya) is known
> either by suggestion or by any other

(significative) power on the basis of one (common) attribute.

It would not be too wide a definition with regard to Raśanopamā because of the adjunct 'anyonyena' ('mutual'). Again, because of the adjunct 'to be known either by suggestion or by any other (significative) power', — it would not be too wide a definition with regard to Ubhayaviśrāntasādṛśyopamā (Upamā, in which similarity rests on both the sides). By the expression 'vā' (i.e., 'either by' ..... 'or by') which denotes option (of one out of two) mutually opposed things, the following explanation (of the definition) is reached at : the simile which is connected with the state of mutual counter-entities
39 (and) which is known either by suggestion, having no connection with any other significative power relating to that (i.e., Upamā) or is known by some other significative power, having no connection with the power of suggestion relating to that (i.e., Upamā), — is to be known as Upameyopamā. Thus, in Ubhayaviśrāntasādṛśyopamā there is suggestion in the part of the state of mutual counter-entities and (some) other power in the part of simile in the form of similarity; and thus are blended (here) and hence there is no apprehension of being too wide a definition. For the implementation of the definition in general, suggestion and other (significative) power have been accepted (here) as being collected as mutually related. Thus, the definition conforms to the following example 'tayā gṛhītaṃ nu mṛgāṅganābhyaḥ' (i.e., whether she has imitated it from the doe') where the simile, which has not assumed the state of a figure of speech is known by suggestion

having dependence on other (significative) power or (elsewhere) in a simile which has assumed the state of a figure of speech and is known by other (significative) power having no dependence on the suggestion. Although in a suggested Upameyopamā also words are associates and as such the power in it also is required and also in the expressed (upameyopamā) such as "Like sky is the water and like water is the sky" and the like, where the common property is suggested, suggestion with regard to property in that is required; and hence mutual independence is impossible; still there exists the state of independence of the suggestion with regard to other significative power relating to similarity qualified by mutual counter-entities and (again, there exists) independence of other significative power with regard to suggestion relating to that (similarity). This again is the special definition of Upameyopamā as a figure of speech also if the word 'suggestion' ('vyakti') is not taken into consideration. There, (in the definition), giving up the word 'suggestion' the adjunct runs thus — 'known by some other significative power' only. Thus, Ubhayaviśrānta-sādṛśyopamā is excluded. It is unjustified to say that this (i.e., giving up of the word 'vyakti' i.e., suggestion) is useless, since, there the state of being Upamāna is of a single object only and not of the two and thus exclusion (of it) may be done by the very word 'mutual'; because, although in the description of similarity between a contextual and a non-contextual, it is the non-contextual which attains the state of Upamāna, still, as there is no determining factor where both the two are contextual, the state of being Upamāna to each other is understood. Thus, it would not be

too wide a definition with regard to Parasparopamā as met in the verse beginning with 'rajobhiḥ syandanotkīrṇaiḥ' since the object of property has been qualified. By virtue of the same adjunct, it would not be too wide a definition with regard to Upamā also as is seen in the verse beginning with 'pitā samārādhanatatpareṇa', since, in both the cases the subjects of comparison possess different properties. Again, the meaning of 'on the basis of one property' ('ekadharmāśrayā') is this — the same property which is common or involves the relation of a prototype and its copy in a simile of something with someotherelse, should be so in the simile of other with that also and the meaning is not that it would be based on a property in conformity, since that is not found in the relation of a prototype and its copy intermingled with the relation of an original and its image. Thus (Upameyopamā) is hinted at.

In fact, it is the definition leading to the state of Upameyopamā only. But the definition which is not too wide and applicable everywhere should be taken as follows —

That is known as Upameyopamā where
40 the mutual state of being subject of comparison is intended to exclude a third similar object.

Here the adjunct 'mutual' is to exclude a variety of Pratīpa which is noticed in the verse beginning with 'aham eva guruḥ sudāruṇānām'.

Now follow the examples. Of them, an example in the commonness in property is the following one —

> Like sky is the water and like water is the sky; like moon is the swan and like swan is the moon; like lotuses are the stars and like stars are the lotuses.

This is an example where the common property is suggested. Example, where the common property is expressed, is seen in (the verse beginning with) 'sugandhi nayanānandi' and the like.

Or for example, —

> This lord of elephants like the mountain is shining very much and the mountain (also) like the lord of the elephants (is shining very much). The flow of ichor like the fountain is flowing (and) the fountain like its stream of ichor is flowing.

Here a special charm is added since the couple of Upameyopamās favour each other.

Example of a relation of prototype and its copy is seen in (the verse beginning with) 'sacchāyāmbhoja-vadanā' and the like.

It is an example of the relation of an original and its image qualifying the relation of a prototype and its copy. Example of it (i.e. of the relation of an original and its image) being qualified is as follows —

> Face of hers is like the lotus and eyes are charming like the hornets. (Again),

the lotus looks like the face embellished
by deer-like eyes.

All these are examples of Upameyopamā by rotation.

Example of Yugapadupameyopamā (Simultaneous Reciprocal Comparison) is noticed in the verse beginning with — 'tad valgunā yugapad unmiṣitena'.

There also the varieties as noted before may be understood as far as possible.

Here ends the section on Upameyopamā.

-: oOo :-

Ananvaya (Self-Comparison) is now being described.

That is known as the figure Ananvaya (Self-Comparison) where the same object attains both the state of the Upamāna and the Upameya. By the force of the expression 'eva' it has to be understood that the (state of Upamāna and Upameya) should relate to one single function of comparison. Hence it would not be too-wide a definition with regard to Upameyopamā and Rasanopamā. An example (of Ananvaya) is the following — "Sky has the appearance of the sky (only); the ocean is
41 comparable to the ocean (only)". Here the attribute is suggested. Example of the figure involving a particular attribute is the following verse —

That beautiful lady of superb charms looks
splendid like herself alone; — not this

much only, — also her amours, the very abode of Cupid's gentle frolics, are (only) like themselves.

How is it then, that in,

Thus, having obtained the kingdom after having passed the period of exile in forests by the command of his father, Rāma carried on even dealing well with his younger brothers as with virtue, wealth and desire.

the same Raghupati occupies the position of both the Upamāna and Upameya but Ananvaya is not admitted ? Since, by Samuccayopamā, the idea that he (i.e. Rāma) behaved equally to his younger brothers as well as to virtue, wealth and desire, has been meant to be established and as such exclusion of another similar object is not the purport. Likewise, in the expression "I will abandon the daughter of the king of Videha as formerly I did the ocean-girded earth at my father's command" also both the state of Upamāna and Upameya belong to the same self-object. But therealso no Ananvaya is admitted; since, there is no possibility of another similar object in (mentioning) the banishment of Sītā for fear of calumny like the relinquishment of empire by the order of father and as such there is no concern with regard to a result of the exclusion of that (similar object). Similarly, in (the verse) —

The thousand-beamed luminary (i.e. the Sun) held over his head a sun-shade newly made by the artisan of the gods. When the crest

> of the Lord was not very far from its white silken fringe, it seemed as if the stream of Gaṅgā was falling upon his head.

also, the state of both the Upamāna and Upameya belonging to one object is clear. Nor can it be said that there exists a relation of Upamāna and Upameya between the behaviour towards religion etc. and that towards younger brothers in one of these examples, or between the relinquishment of kingdom and the banishment of Sītā in another example, or between the falling of the Ganges and the setting of the garments in still another example; but nowhere does the state of Upamāna and that of Upameya belong to the same substance because of the propriety of the association of adjuncts in the case of impediment to the same with regard to the substance (viśeṣya) when there is a relation between the qualified (viśeṣaṇa). Although the relation of Upamāna and an Upameya of the same object may be established in a manner, for example, as he behaved towards the religion, wealth and desire similarly he behaved towards younger brothers still if 'viśeṣaṇasaṃkrānti' be considered then in the verse beginning with 'pāṇḍyoyam aṃsārpitalambaharaḥ' too there would be a relation of an Upamāna and an Upameya between the necklace etc. and fountain etc. only and thus the question of disappearance of examples of a relation of an original and its image would arise and also since it is not required on the part of the rhetoricians who admit the relation of an Upamāna and an Upameya in identity too as is noticed in the example 'rāmarāvaṇayor yuddham' etc. to find a solution to impediment to 'viśeṣya' (relation between substances). Thus, presentation of the rule (nyāya), namely, 'saviśeṣaṇe hi' etc.,

in this context, suits the Vākyamīmāṃsakas only and not literary critics. The Vākyamīmāṃsakas hold-there exists no relation of an Upamāna and an Upameya in identity and

42 hence in the example 'rāmarāvaṇayor yuddham' etc. they consider the war held in ancient era as the Upamāna to the present-day war (and similarly) the sky of another kalpa as the Upamāna to the sky of this kalpa and so on. Thus, according to the rhetoricians, the relation of an Upamāna and an Upameya of the same object, is seen in these cases and hence the definition involves the fallacy of being too-wide and as such —

We maintain here as follows —

Comparison of something with its own self,
based on one single property in conformity,
is known as Ananvaya which possesses a
connotative name.

It would not be too-wide a definition with regard to Upameyopamā and Rasanopamā because of the adjunct 'svasya svena' ('comparison with its own self'). It would not be too-wide a definition with regard to the varieties of Upamā already illustrated because of the adjunct 'anugāmyekadharmikā' ('based on a single property in conformity'). Although in them in the portion 'samāṃ vṛttiṃ prapede' etc., there has been an infiltration of the property in conformity, yet the property is not a single one. Since, that is intermingled with the relation of an original and its image between, for example, the virtue, wealth and desire and the younger brothers. Thus the inclusion of (the adjunct) 'eka' ('single') is significant. 'Anvarthanāmadheya' ('name

having connotation') is not part of the definition but is meant for establishing that if the comparison of something with its own self is based on one single property in conformity — then only it is a case of Ananvaya and not otherwise. Comparison of something with its own self, when there is oneness in property, is Ananvaya which is a significant name in so far as it means — that which is not related to (anything else). And as the word means 'having non-connection', it results in the suggestion of incomparability. In divergence of properties, comparison of something limited by a particular property with its own self limited by another property can be connected and in that case the name (i.e. Ananvaya) fails to bear its connotation and moreover, the result, namely, incomparability, dependent on the idea — not related to anything else, is not achieved. This definition establishes the state of Ananvaya. For the actual definition, what Bhāmaha said — "yatra tenaiva tasya syāt", may be considered. The adjunct 'tenaiva tasya' is included to avoid the fault of being too wide a definition with regard to a variety of Atiśayokti that involves the presumption of similarity and results in the suggestion of incomparability as is seen in the verse beginning with 'ubhau yadi vyomni pṛthakpravāhau".

This Ananvaya may be suggested also. For example —

> O Govinda, the feeling of satisfaction
> that I have to-day by your coming to my
> house — may this satisfaction be for me
> again ere long only by your coming here
> again.

Here the idea that the delight resulting from your arrival is similar to that delight itself only and not to that resulting from anything else, is suggested in the words of Vidura, addressed to Śrīkṛṣṇa, who has arrived at his house, in the following manner -- the delight resulting from your arrival will be produced again by your arrival only after a long interval and not

43 by any other means. To exclude such type of examples, in the definition of Ananvaya, the adjunct, namely, 'the state of being not-suggested', is to be understood as before.

Here ends the section on Ananvaya.

-: oOo :-

Now begins the figure Smaraṇa (Reminiscence).

> That is called the figure Smaraṇa (Reminiscence) in which there is reminiscence which is qualified by the epithet 'not-suggested' and is based on similarity and connected with another object.

As for example --

> Having at that moment been put in mind of the braided hair of his beloved (queen) interpersed with variegated flowers and the knot of which was made loose in amatory sports, the king did not aim his arrow at the peacock though hopping about his horse, and wearing a beautiful plumage.

Or, for example, –

> Śauri (i.e. Śrīkṛṣṇa), having seen in front of him, a lady resembling Laxmī, coming out of water with a shinning lotus in her beautiful hand and causing astonishment even to the gods, recollected the churning of the ocean.

In one case the sight of a similar thing causes the reminiscence of another thing having a similar property. In the other case there has been a reminiscence of the churning of the ocean connected with Laxmī, who is similar to the former. In both the cases, reminiscence of another object on the basis of similarity remains the same. And hence, mention of 'vastvantara' ('another object') in the definition is justified as it includes similar or dissimilar objects in general.

> "O Laxmaṇa (lit. the son of Sumitrā) ! let us take shelter beneath the tree, since the sun has risen." "O Raghupati ! how do you speak of the sun at night ? (In fact), it is the moon that is appearing". "O brother ! how do you come to know this ?" "Since it possess the mark of a deer." "Where are you my dear wife, O Jānakī, having a moon-like face and deer-like eyes."

Here, out of the recollection of the eyes relating to deer that has been mentioned, there has been a recollection of the eyes of Sītā that are similar to the former and also that of Sita related to those eyes. But this is suggested and (itself) deserves to be embellished (and not embellishment). To exclude this, there is the

adjunct 'avyaṅgyatva' ('not-suggested').

On all sides there rise these lofty moun-
tains and wide expanding oceans — though
thou bearest all these, yet thou feelest
not the slightest fatigue, — all reverence
44 too thee — while, struck with
wonder, I was thus singing the
praises of the Earth, I remembered your arm,
O king, bearing, as it does, the burden even
of this earth, and thereupon my speech
became sealed.

Recollection of the arms of the king relating to the earth, which is being eulogized, is not based on similarity and hence here the figure is not Smaraṇa. But the figure is preyas, since recollection, the transitory sentiment, is subordinate to the sentiment of love relating to the king.

He, the chastiser of love, having promised — this shall be done and having departed from Umā with an effort, recollected the seven luminous sages.

Here, reminiscence has, contemplation as its basis. Because of the absence of any special charm, there is no figure at all. To exclude both these two (examples) the adjunct 'sādṛśyamūlā' is included in the definition. Thus, figures, having at their base similarity which involves difference and identification, have been shown.

Here ends the section on Smaraṇa.

-: oOo :-

Now Rūpaka (Metaphor) is being determined at first in the group of figures having predominance of identity.

> That is known as Rūpaka where the superimposed embellishes the subject of superimposition which has not lost its own existence.

Here, by the expression 'āropaviṣayasya', figure Utprekṣā and Atiśayokti have been excluded. Since, in those two figures, face and the like do not possess the state of the subject of superimposition there. By the expression 'atirohitarūpiṇaḥ', figures Sasandeha, Bhrāntimad and Apahnuti are excluded, since, owing to doubt, error and denial, the subject in them has disappeared. By the expression 'uparañjaka', figures Samāsokti and Pariṇāma are excluded, since, in those two (figures) there exists, in the subject, no embellishment which consists in the state of establishing absence of identity, because, in Samāsokti, owing to the superimposition of behaviour only, the very cognition of identity is not existent and because in Pariṇāma as the superimposed itself attains identity with the subject (of superimposition), it lacks in attainment of identity of the subject (of superimposition) with the superimposed. This is what the ancients say.

This is being examined here -- considering what type of distinction between superimposition and introsusception it has been said that the figure Utprekṣā has been excluded by the expression 'āropaviṣayasya' ? If it has been said with this idea in view that the distinction follows thus -- superimposition consists of the cognition of identity between the Viṣaya (subject of superimposition) and

the Viṣayin (subject of the superimposition) expressed, whereas 'Introsusception' consists in cognition of identity of the Viṣayin (subject of comparison) with that (i.e. Viṣaya) by way of swallowing up of the Viṣaya, then (we have to admit that) the figure Utprekṣā is based on superimposition only; since, it lacks in that 'nigaraṇa' (i.e. swallowing up) for its mention of the Viṣaya as well as of the face as in noticed in the example — "Obviously (this face is the moon". Thus the fault of being too wide a definition with regard to that (i.e. Utprekṣā) remains unremedied

45 there. Superimposition consists of the cognition of sameness, whereas introsusception consists in the cognition of identity — this is their distinction. In the expression "The face is the moon" and the like which are the examples of Rūpaka, by the 'moon-ness' which is the fundamental property of the moon, one understands only the possession of beauty of the face and not the identity with the well-known moon. In an example of Atiśayokti like "It's the moon" having the face as its Viṣaya, it is the identity which is recognised. If it is said so, it would be unjustified, since, the contrary also can be spoken of. Nor is it justified to say that in the following example, namely,

> The moon-like face of the deer-eyed
> women surpasses even the moon (in
> beauty); (since) although being drunken
> by gods, it never decays.

as the description of surpassingness of the moon-like face from the well-known moon is not possible if the cognition of identity (is accepted), it is the cognition of sameness

that exists in Rūpaka. Because, if it be so admitted, then, in Atiśayokti, such as --

> [O you ! please,] cast your glances at the top of the palace in front of you and think for a while -- who should be this moon without the deer and (seen) not in the sky (but in the garret) and who is emitting white beams having semblance with the ripening of the Lavali fruit and being followed by Cakora birds of the garden, fond of drinking honey.

and in 'Another Indra' and in Utprekṣā such as, "As if another Indra" there would only be the cognition of sameness like Rūpaka for its lacking in the cognition of identity with the well-known moon and thus the fault of being too-wide a definition with regard to those two (i.e. Atiśayokti and Utprekṣā) would remain unremedied. Now, if it is said that although it lacks in the cognition of identity with the well-known moon and the like, still the cognition of identity with another imaginary moon and the like as mentioned is possible, then, the same may be argued with regard to Rūpaka also and thus the application of the definition would be impossible. Moreover, the fault of being too-wide a definition with regard to Apahnava cannot be prevented by the expression 'atirohitarūpiṇaḥ' inspite of the prevention of being too-wide a definition with regard to Sasandeha and Bhrāntimat. Thus, in the example, "This is not a face but the moon", it lacks in the abolition of the 'viṣaya', since the superimposition of the absence of 'faceness' and superimposition of 'moon-ness' on the face are artificial. Application of the definition would be impossible

even in Rūpaka if the artificial superimposition also is taken as responsible for the abolition (of 'viṣaya'). Moreover, the adjunct 'āropaviṣayasya' would be useless, since, the exclusion of Utprekṣā which consists in artificial possibility, is established by the very expression 'atirohitarūpiṇaḥ'. In Atiśayokti, since the viṣaya disappears owing to its being swallowed up, its exclusion also would be made by this very (adjunct). Moreover, it would be too wide a definition with regard to Nidarśanā as in the following —

> That the gems in the form of your toe-
> 46 ) nails are being dyed with lac
> is like rendering the moon
> pale with sandal paste.

since, there exists the superimposition of sameness of the meaning in the sentence used as the standard of comparison on the meaninge of the sentence used as the subject of comparison. If the expression 'āropaviṣayasya' is taken as an adjunct to 'padārthasya' (i.e. of the idea contained in a word) then also it would be found too wide a definition with regard to the ~~following example~~ above expression of Nidarśanā, viz., "The dying of your toe-nails with lac is rendering of the moon pale with sandal paste." It would be too ~~wide~~ narrow a definition ~~with regard to~~ to cover Rupaka also, as noticed in —

> May the sturdy foot of Lord Viṣṇu, thrust
> upward to vanquish (the demon) Vali, acting
> as the stalk of the lotus (sprung from
> Viṣṇu's navel), the abode of Brahmā, be
> the cause of your delight.

What again has been stated by the author of the Saraswatīkaṇṭhābharaṇa, viz.,

> Then it is called Rūpaka when the words relating to Upamāna, having taken resort to the secondary power, are used to convey the Upameya.

is also found to be too wide a definition with regard to Atiśayokti. Since, rhetoricians have admitted Gauṇasāropalakṣaṇā (Qualitative Superimponent Indication) with reference to the face in the case of Rūpaka such as, "The face is moon" and Sādhyavasānalakṣaṇā (Introsusceptive Indication) in the case of Atiśayokti as in "This is the moon". In fact, it can be established that indication exists in Atiśayokti only and not in Rūpaka. Since, in Atiśayokti, as no word like 'mukha' denoting the object of superimposition (viṣaya) is used, that has to be conveyed only by words like 'candra' and hence, for that word, indication must be adopted there. In Rūpaka, the cognition of identity between the object of superimposition and the superimposed which are expressed by the respective expressive words, is possible by virtue of their mere positional proximity. Hence, what is the use of accepting indication there ? It is impossible too to admit indication there. Why ? In the expression "The face is moon", based on what, the moon-ness, being imposed on face by indication, be conveyed ? Is it based on the face-ness or on the particular kind of uncommon beauty of the face, or on the moon-ness, or on the particular kind of uncommon beauty of the moon, or on the commonness of beauty found in both the face and the moon, or on the similarity of the face with the moon ? The first possibility cannot be accepted, because it would give rise to tautology caused by the word 'mukha'; since, face-ness has no connection with the primary meaning (of 'candra') and as such indication based on that is not possible. Hence, the second possibility

(also) cannot be accepted; nor can the third and fourth (possibilities) be accepted, since, the properties which do not belong to the face, cannot stand as the cause for the use of the expression in question. The fifth possibility (also) cannot be accepted, since it would give rise to tautology in the expression "The moon-face is lovely" by the word 'kāntimat'. Nor even the sixth possibility can be accepted, since the existence of Rūpaka separate from that of Upamā would (in that case) not stand owing to the similarity being conveyed by words and not suggested and (since) it would go against the decision that in Rūpaka identity is predominant. Thus it should be said that in Rūpaka, the cognition of identity between the object of
47 superimposition and the superimposed, expressed by respective terms, is to be made by virtue of positional proximity only and hence 'Impossibility' also is a fault of (this) definition. But when, in examples such as "That another moon is emerging in the presence of your moon-face" and "O King ! two moons are in the world — one that's in the sky and yourself on the surface of the earth", where the cognition of identity of the object of superimposition with the well-known moon is not possible, somehow indication in words such as 'Indu' is taken into consideration with reference to the object of superimposition. Still it is very difficult to overcome the fault of being too narrow a definition to cover the expression "The lovely moon-face" and the like since it is unjustified to accept there a very far-fetched indication because the cognition of identity is possible by virtue of mere positional proximity as in the expression 'kāṭhakādhyāpaka' ('He is a professor belonging to the kaṭha school'). Moreover, it would be found too narrow to cover the cases of

suggested Rūpaka as in the following verses and the like —

> O Lord ! formerly you constructed the bridge with rocks to win over Rāvaṇa (lit. the ten-headed); (but) whom to win over, are you constructing (another bridge) with stones in the form of moon-like fame to-day ?

> Having seen you, those eyes of mine, that had been eager to see the 'wish-yielding tree' for long, have become fruitful to-day.

Here in the first example, the Rūpaka, namely, 'you are none but Rāma', is being suggested by the idea, namely, 'you constructed the bridge for the slaying of Rāvaṇa', communicated to the lord, who is being described. But there is no secondary word, viz. Rāma with reference to the subject of description. In the second (example), the Rūpaka, namely, 'you are none but the 'wish-yielding tree',' is being suggested by the suggested figure Viśeṣa (Special) in the following manner — 'looking at you, my eyes had the long-cherished sight of the 'wish-yielding tree'. There, the word 'kalpavṛkṣa' denotes the very well-known 'wish-yielding tree' and it does not convey the object of superimposition by indication. The point is thus clear.

Moreover, it would be found too narrow to cover the Rūpaka based on Pure Superimponent Indication as in the following and the like —

> Then the direction belonging to Mahendra i.e. the east, was adorned by the moon,

> the lord of night-lotuses, pale like the
> cheek of a passionate woman and the delight
> of eyes.

Here, the delineation of the state of joy is (done) as it possesses the cause of joy and not on account of comparison. It is unjustified to say that there exists no figure in cases of Pure Superimponent Indication as is seen in the expression "clarified butter is longevity" and the like, since, the question of the absence of the state of a figure of speech in cases of Qualitative Superimponent Indication also, where no special charm is noticed as in the expression "The Vāhīka is a bull" and the like, would arise. It can be maintained heretoo that the state of a figure of speech (is admitted) if variety exists somewhereelse although it does not exist in a given example. For example, "By the moon in the form of joy of eyes". (Moreover), since variety is noticed in cases of Pure Superimponent Indication as noticed in the following verse and the like also, (the question of being too narrow a definition would remain as before) —

> This king is the very longevity in the
> joyous giving of gifts, trust-incarnate
> to vassal princes who bow to him, object
> of great festivity to the eyes of gazelle-
> 48 eyed ladies, the great effulgence
> of spreading fame, joy in bodily
> form to the good people, the very life of
> the wealth of valour, and the abode of
> righteousness; thus ever victorious is
> this great king of Kaliṅga.

If it is taken as granted that there exists the figure Hetu (Cause) and not the figure Rūpaka by the acceptance of another view, namely, mention of the cause as identified with the effect — is the figure Hetu then the definition mentioned earlier as 'āropaviṣayasya syāt ......', would be found too wide with regard to that (Hetu). Likewise, faults like being too wide a definition are to be understood as far as possible even in the definitions like "The very Upamā, with its distinction (between the Upamāna and the Upameya) elided, is called ~~Metaphor~~ (Rupaka)", (or) "The identity between the standard and subject of comparison is Rūpaka". Here we suggest (the following definition) —

> Then it is called Rūpaka when the Viṣayin i.e., the Upamāna, attains charmingness while the Viṣaya i.e., the Upameya, which is not connected (with the Viṣayin) by a relation of an original (and its image) and is expressed (in words) and does not involve any negation.

Since it possesses the adjunct 'bimbāviśiṣṭe' (i.e. which is not connected by a relation of an original and its image), it would not be too wide a definition with regard to Nidarśanā such as 'tvatpādanakharatnānām'. The relation of an original and its image exists there on the basis of the similarity noticed in the following manner — as the moon is white by nature and hence whiteness (in it) cannot be glutened, similarly, the nails are reddish by nature and as such redness (in them) cannot be glutened. It happens so that in other places the lac-dye and sandal paste gluten (their) own colour (to other objects). Thus, 'rendering pale' which is connected with the moon and the

sandal paste and has turned to be the image of that (i.e. bimba), is the cause of charm to the dyeing which is connected with the nails and lac-dye and happens to be the 'original' there. Similarly, elsewhere too, in all instances of Nidarśanā which possesses a superimposition of sameness, such as 'araṇyaruditaṃ kṛtam' ('Made in vain'), the standard of comparison, which is qualified by the image of that (i.e. the Original) happens to be the cause of charm to the subject of comparison which is qualified by an object which has attained the state of an original — and hence nowhere it would be found too wide a definition. But nowhere in Rūpaka, the Viṣaya and the Viṣayin are mentioned as being qualified by an attribute which has turned to be related as original and its image. In Sāvayava Rūpaka ( Metaphor, possessed of parts ) also different is the superimposition of parts from the superimposition of the 'whole' (Viśeṣya) and it is not a superimposition on the Viśeṣya as qualified by the parts. In the verse beginning with 'aṅghridaṇḍo harer ūrdham' also, the sturdy leg and the stalk of the lotus do not possess the relation of an original and its image, since, the relation of a standard and a subject of comparison (may be established) by the mere suggested property in conformity, namely, bluishness, connection with lotus-seat of the Lord and the like. But the subject of comparison is qualified by the adjunct to establish the possession of the common property, namely, the connection with the lotus-seat of the Lord.

It would not be too wide a definition with regard to Atiśayokti where the subject is introsuscepted because of the mention of the) adjunct 'nirdiṣṭa' (i.e. expressed in words). In the examples of suggested Rūpaka although

there is no mention of the word expressive of the Viṣayin, (still), mention of the Viṣaya is essential and as such it would not involve there the fallacy of being too narrow.

49 If the opinion, namely, in 'netrānandena' etc., the figure is Hetu be maintained, that (i.e. the figure Hetu) would be excluded by the expression 'viṣaye' meaning 'Upameye' (i.e. in the Upameya). If the opinion of the author of the Ekāvalī and others, namely, heretoo the figure is Rūpaka, be admitted, the word 'viṣaya' standing for 'dharmin' (possessed of property) is used only for the purpose of clarification.

It would not be too wide a definition with regard to Apahnuti because of the adjunct 'anihnute' meaning 'niṣedhāspṛṣṭe' (i.e., in a case having no connection with negation).

Fallacy of being too-wide a definition with regard to Sasandeha, Utprekṣā, Samāsokti, Pariṇāma and Bhrāntimān is checked by the expression 'uparañjakatām eti' meaning 'becomes the object of a supposititious certitude of identity'; since, Sasandeha and Utprekṣā are lacking in the very certitude and since in Samāsokti and Pariṇāma no identification with that (i.e. Upamāna) is noticed. Because in Samāsokti there exists only the superimposition of behaviour and in Pariṇāma cognition of identification of the superimposed with the Viṣaya is noticed. And since in Bhrāntimān natural (identification) upto the point of certain movements etc. (on the part of the objects described), which is either real or imaginary is delineated, the same cannot be taken as supposititious.

This is the definition of Rūpaka as a figure of speech since it possesses the adjunct 'not suggested' and

thus well-suited is this definition in all aspects. That Rūpaka is of three types — Niravayava i.e. Partless, Sāvayava i.e. Possessed of parts and Paramparitava i.e. Consequential. Niravayava is of two varieties, namely, Kevala i.e. Single and Mālā i.e. Serial. Sāvayava again is divided into two, namely, 'that which relates to the whole object' and 'that which resides in only a portion'. Paramparita being two-fold owing to its resting on punning or non-punning words, is, by virtue of its (further) two-fold division, such as Kevala and Mālā, (altogether) of four types. Thus, the figure Rūpaka is of eight varieties. Of them, an example of the variety of Kevalaniravayava is the following one —

> I know that Cupid is engaged in sprinkling the new creeper of love in her mind since she, like a doe, makes motionless her limbs at the sound of music (and) asks her friend news again about her lover although heard before and since she lies inside the house without sleep.

An example of (the variety of) Mālāniravayava is the following one —

> That beloved is the river of beauty, the rise of the joy of the excellence of youth, the practice of magic on loveliness, the abode of the flourishing of sportive copulation, the science of crooked words, the visible manifestation of the unlimited skill of the creator, the (very) life of Cupid and the crest jewel of women.

An example of (the variety of) the Sāvayava, dwelling in all the objects is the following one —

This Kāpālikī in the form of night wanders
from continent to continent — (the Kāpālikī)
who possesses a white complexion on account
of smearing ashes in the form of moonlight,
50 who bears bones in the form of
stars, who takes delight in the
sport of disappearance (and) who holds in
her consecrated skull-vessel in the form of
the moon the power of the magic ointment
(placed) under the guise of the spot (of
the moon).

An example of the variety of the Sāvayava, residing in only a portion is the following one —

Raindrops, the friends of kuṭaja flowers,
with their lustre like big pearls, possessed the beauty of the offering of flowers
made by lightning in the theatre hall of
the atmospherical region.

Here, since the atmospherical region is depicted as the theatre hall, the state of a female dancer of the lightnings is understood by virtue of the expressed idea and hence it is a case of Ekadeśavivarti as the expression of the adjunct relating to Rūpaka is applied in a portion only.

An example of Kevalaparamparita drawn through the use of words involving pun is the following one —

O lord, by whom are you not praised, you,

who happens to be a precious pearl in a nice piece of bamboo in the form of your aristocrat family and who have illumined the three worlds with your super-mundane excellent brilliance.

Here, 'yourself are a precious pearl' — with such a superimposition stands the (second) superimposition, namely, 'Sadvaṃśa' — meaning, an aristocrat family, is a 'sadvaṃśa', meaning a nice piece of bamboo; — thus, both the two Rūpakas are connected consequentially and hence it is a case of Paramparita and it is based on a punning word, nemely, 'vaṃśa'. That itself (i.e. Rūpaka, based on punning words) as Mālāparamparita is seen in the following —

O lord, the swan in the Mānasa lake in the form of the learned, the sun for the blooming of lotuses in the form of the destruction of the glory of enemies, Śiva in searching Pārvatī in the form of impossibility of the search of (your) forts (by others), fire in the consumption of fuels in the form of the acceptance of (challenge for) battles, Dakṣa showing disaffection towards Satī in the form of being adept in maintaining love for truth, Bhīma in the precedence -in-birth over Arjuna in the form of being dreadful in early achievements of victory, the excellent warrior, gloriously you enjoy sovereignty for a hundred years of Brahman.

An example of the variety of Kevalaparamparita,

not based on punning words, is the following one –

> You there, who have assumed the form of a tortoise are the first victorious in this world – you whose position knows no bound and does not depend (on others) and from where lot of festivities do not return to (anyone else) and who are the root of the creeper in the form of the fourteen worlds.

That itself as Mālāparamparita is seen in the following –

> The sword of the king of Mālawa is winning victory in the battle – the sword which is the bed of the royal fortune decked with yellow gems, the wave of ocean in the form of valour,
> 51 acting as a cloud towards the playful movement of the swan in the form of fame of the lord of Muralā oppressed by fear in battle, acting as a piece of ~~wet cloth~~ cloth on the flow of ichor for the host of victorious elephants enveloping the very birth of the offspring of defeated rival and like the chamberlain of the world.

This is found in divergence of properties also. An example of this in the Kevala variety is the following –

> The stream of blood gushing out from the wounds made by weapons (on the bodies) of elephants, horses and warriors proved

(lit. became) as it were the newly risen sun to the all-pervading darkness caused by dust that obstructed the range of sight in the battle.

An example of Mālārūpaka is the following one –

They who inspired with foolish hopes, have served even these host of kings in the Kali era – the desert for the water of goodness, the aerial wall for the paintings of noble deeds, the fourteenth night of the dark fortnight for the moon-shine of merit, the very elegance of the dog's tail in respect of simplicity – for these hard but vain toilers, how much capacity would be required to serve Śiva (lit. bearer of the trident) who is easily accessible by faith alone.

Thus eight varieties of the figure Rūpaka have been shown by the ancients. Such varieties may be spoken of in respect of Upamā also, (but) those are not mentioned, since in a manner shown in one place (similar varieties) can be conjectured in other possible cases also. Thus, in 'vāgarthāviva sampṛktau' etc., we have Kevalaniravayavopamā. In 'jyotsneva nayanānandaḥ' etc., we have Mālāniravayavopamā.

Thence Raghu, like the sun taking up the sap (of the earth) with its rays, careered towards the direction of Kuvera (i.e. to north) in order to extirpate the northerners with his arrows.

Here the figure is Samastavastuviṣayasāvayavopamā (Upamā, possessed of parts and involving the whole object).

> The pools appeared charming at every step with blue-lotuses like eyes, with lotuses like faces and with Cakravāka birds like breasts.

Here the figure is Ekadeśavivartinī (i.e. resting in a portion only).

> The western direction like a harlot drove away the sun which though very much reddish has the heap of its wealth (of rays) exhausted (like a person who though having much attachment has his accumulation of wealth spent).

Heretoo (the Upamā is) Ekadeśavivartinī. The distinction (between these two examples) is this -- in the former, in the instance of Viśeṣaṇopamā, Viśeṣyopamā is suggested, (whereas) in the latter Viśeṣaṇopamā is suggested by the Viśeṣyopamā.

> The shore of the ocean resembling an iron-wheel which is dark on account of
> 52 the row of Tamāla and Tālī forests, is appearing owing to distance, like a thin line of rust formed on the edge of the wheel.

Here the figure is Kevalaparamparitopamā which is based on non-punning words. Upamā, here, is of the ocean with the iron-wheel. (Again), Upamā of the shore is with the line of rust on the edge of a wheel and thus both these

two have turned to be consequential.

Or for example,

While my father, the preceptor of all the foremost archers, is acting like the submarine fire in the midst of the ocean of the rival-warriors licked by the flame of his weapons, and remains the commander of the army, there is no ground, O Karṇa ! for this flurry ! O Kṛpa, repair to the battle ! O Kṛtavarman, give up fear ! While my father, aided by his bow, is bearing the brunt of the battle, where can there be any room for fear ?

Here, the simile of Droṇa with the submarine fire is the establishing factor of the simile between the rival force and the ocean and thus both the two similies have turned to be consequential. Likewise, in "This king acts like a flamingo in the Mānasa-lake in the form of the heart (Mānasa) of the wise" the figure is Kevalaparamparitopamā based on a punning word. Mālāparamparita variety in both the cases is to be understood in the same manner. "The pool of blood acts like the morning sun for darkness caused by dust" — here the simile is drawn through difference of property like a Rūpaka. Thus, (in) all aspects (they) are equal.

But the point of distinction is this — Samasta-vastu-viṣayarūpaka (Rūpaka involving all objects) cannot be considered a special type of Rūpaka, since, it is the figure Nidarśanā that has been admitted while the ~~identification~~ sameness

between the Viṣaya and the Viṣayin, qualified by a relation of an original and its image is superimposed. But Sāvayavopamā suggests the Viśiṣṭopamā (i.e. Simile resting in the qualified). Since, the similarity of Raghu qualified as 'gone towards the northern direction for extirpating the northerners with his arrows' with the sun qualified as 'gone towards the northern direction for taking up the sap (of the earth) with (its) rays', as the resultant meaning of the verse beginning with "tataḥ pratasthe kauverīṃ bhāsvān iva", is understood. Thus, suggestion somewhere by an Upamā and elsewhere of the Upamā culminates to be four-fold. Somewhere an Upamā between the qualified (is suggested) by an Upamā between the adjuncts, as in the expression 'viśvajit sarvapṛṣṭho'tirātraḥ', injunction of the qualified, namely, 'Pṛṣṭha', can be understood from the injunction of all-pervasiveness relating to (the sacrifice) 'Pṛṣṭha'. Somewhere the simile between the adjuncts is suggested by the simile between the qualified just as the injunction of the group of various subordinate rites relating to the original sacrifice is indicated by the main rites relating to the branch sacrifice. Both are exemplified as Ekadeśa-vivarti. Somewhere an Upamā resting in the qualified is suggested by that resting in the parts, just as the injunction of the performance belonging to the main sacrifice comprising all the subordinate ones can be understood from the group of injunctions belonging to the foremost of the subordinate sacrifices. That has been shown in the example of Upamā relating to all objects. This example relates to the suggestion of simile resting in the qualified by a simile resting in parts in a single sentence. It is seen in the divergence of sentence also. For example —

As much the wicked, like a hand soiled
with ashes, oppresses the good, who is
53 like a mirror, so much does he add the
shining glory to him.

Here the figure is Avayavopamā. Upamā relating to the qualified is understood (here) in this manner — as a hand soiled with ashes makes a mirror clear all the more by rubbing (it) more and more, so the wicked, by oppressing the good more and more, makes him but glorious. Somewhere, simile relating to the qualified, suggests the similes of parts lying thereto, just as statements relating to the attribute and substance are suggested by statements relating to the qualified. For example —

Your face, with the restless eyes and
displaying shining brilliance of teeth,
shines like a lotus with its filaments
slightly visible and bees hovering on it.

Here, from the simile of the qualified with (another) qualified, the relation of a standard and subject of comparison of the eyes and bees, brilliance of the teeth and filaments and of lotus and the face, which happened to be the part of that (i.e. Simile relating to the qualified), is understood. Thus numerous are the varieties of Upamā. Similarly,

Cupid vanquishes the mind of passionate
persons with the palm in the form of
tender leaves of creepers, with the
lotuses in the form of hands (of women),
with the faces in the form of lotuses of
lotus-beds and with the moons in the
form of faces of women.

Varieties of Rūpaka also, such as, the 'Girdle-metaphor', are numerous, which may be noticed in the above verse and the like. Thus it is said in Kāvyāloka —

> Since there is no limit to the varieties of Upamā and Rūpaka, only a few are shown and the rests not mentioned are to be understood by the intelligents.

Here ends the section on the figure Rūpaka.

-: oOo :-

Now begins the determination of Pariṇāma (Culmination).

"When what is being superimposed turns useful for the contextual — it is called Pariṇāma (culmination)" — this is stated to be its definition. There the questions arise —

> O Jagannātha ! by (my) mind, speech and body, I take resort to your couple of feet, the boat in the form of mercy for crossing the ocean in the form of birth, old age (and) death.

> The cloud, having seen with its eyes in the form of lightning the face of the woman going to meet her lover at night,
> 54 rumbled with extreme pain thinking whether it is this moon vomitted (by him) along with the showers (of rain).

> See, these are the flowers in the form of fame, white like the moon and grown in the Pārijāta tree in the form of the king of Avantī, which at present I employ as garland of the maids in the form of quarters.

In these verses, although the boat, the eyes and the flower, which are to be superimposed, turn useful to the contextual, namely, crossing, beholding and garlanding, still, by the same author of the said definition, namely, the author of Alaṃkāra-Sarvasva, figure Rūpaka is admitted.

> Know the self to be the passenger of the chariot, the body to be the chariot, intellect the charioteer, and the mind the reins.

In Vedic citations like the above one, although the charioteer and the chariot etc., turn useful to the contextual, namely, the attainment of the utmost reach of path (i.e. Salvation), which is going to be mentioned as — "He attains that utmost reach of path (i.e. Salvation), namely, that highest (blessed) position of Viṣṇu", figure Rūpaka is admitted by the respected Vādarāyaṇa in the following Śārīrakasūtra (i.e. aphorism of the Vedānta philosophy) : "One cannot justify oneself by maintaining that this has also been taken by some to be known by inference, since, this has been accepted as presented with a metaphor drawn from the body and the same is accordingly described." Thus in those cases the definition suffers from being too wide. Similarly, the definition would be found too wide with regard to the following example of Bhrāntimān —

Here the lotus-beds, thinking that it must be the sun (risen) even at night, had their lotuses in bloom while the rays of the moon mingled with various types of rays (emitting) from gems attained thousand-fold in number.

So also in the following example of Apahnuti —

That Kumāra (i.e. Kārtikeya) may shower on you the wealth of celebacy — Kumāra, who ever resides in the heaps of blooming blue-lotuses in the form of the eyes of the heavenly women which were made downwards by the control (over senses) and who does not sit on the beautiful praiseworthy peacock.

So also in the following example of Atiśayokti —

Did a pair of pitchers, appearing on her chest, manifest itself as a fresh present rendered by her (young) age, so that, she, the slender one, having crossed the difficult river of bashfulness, entered the heart of Nala ?

So also in the following example of Anumāna (Inference) —

O mosquito ! I take you to be (the lord) Mādhava, since you move like a wheel as Mādhava makes his disc wielding, since
55 you remain un-noticed by short-sighted persons from a distance as Mādhava remains to be cast off by evil-eyed persons from the distance (and) since

> you play near the ear as Mādhava (i.e. Mādhava's name) ever rings in the ear (of the devotees).

Because, there exists usefulness to the contextual in the rise of the sun (here noticed) in (the instance of) Bhrāntimān, in showering celebacy by the heavenly womens' eyes (here noticed) in (the instance of) Apahnuti, in crossing the river by the couple of pitchers (here noticed) in (the instance of) Atiśayokti and in the moving of the wheel by Mādhava (here noticed) in (the instance of) Anumāna. In Apahnuti, residing in celestial womens' eyes, cast down by virtue of self-control, is useful in bestowing celebacy by the maxim of 'tatkratu' (i.e. that determination), namely, 'one turns to be the same as is one's means of worship.'

> The persistent inward agony is alleviated only by talks with friends. Affliction, caused by separation, is relieved by (the sight of) the moon-like beautiful face of dear.

Further, in this (above example of) Pariṇāma mingled with Dṛṣṭānta, it would be found too narrow. Because, here, the superimposed is useful to the non-contextual which is included in the side of the standard of comparison.

Here it is said: when the superimposed becomes useful as identified with the contextual, it is called Pariṇāma — this is the implication of the definition. If it be so admitted, it would not involve the fallacy of being too wide with regard to the exemplified verses of Rūpaka etc. Because it needs no identification with the

contextual, viz., couple of feet, lightning, fame, the moon etc. for that (i.e. being useful), since, in them, the superimposeds, namely, the boat, the eyes, the flowers, the sun etc. themselves are useful to the purposes like crossing, looking, making of ear-rings, blooming of lotuses etc. Nor is the said definition inapplicable to Pariṇāma, since, there only the figure Pariṇāma is admitted where the superimposed, being introduced as useful to some purpose, needs identification with the contextual as in itself it lacks in such a usefulness. For example — "the woman with fascinating eyes beholds with (her) delighted lotus-like eyes." It is but the usefulness of the lotus toward beholding is described here. Since, owing to the Mayūravyaṃsaka class of compound, the meaning of the second member attains predominance. It is unjustified to say that let it be granted through the acceptance of Upamita compound that it is the usefulness of the eyes only that is described because of the predominance of the first member (in the compound). For, 'Prasannena' ('delighted') as the common property is mentioned (here) and because the injunction of Upamita compound is (made) only when this (i.e. the common property) is not mentioned by the rule — 'upamitaṃ vyāghrādibhiḥ sāmānyāprayoge' (The object of comparison is compounded with words like 'vyāghra' when the common property is not mentioned). Also, the usefulness of the lotus toward beholding is not possible in itself. Hence, the figure is Pariṇāma as it needs the identification with eye which happens to be the contextual. One may say, -- if it be so, then in the example (beginning with)
56 'yāmi manovākkāyaiḥ' and the like also, usefulness of boat etc. toward (the description of) the check of birth and the like indicated by words like 'taraṇa' ('crossing'), is admitted only in the form of the

couple of feet and the like and thus arises the question of admitting Pariṇāma in those cases too. To say so is unjustified, since 'usefulness' is accepted in case of identification (of the superimposed) with that which has the power of establishing the primary meaning which is comprehended in the very beginning through the use of words expressive of the matter at hand and since the power of establishing the primary meaning of the words like 'taraṇya' i.e. boat, is fixed in the words like 'taraṇya' i.e. boat only. Therefore it is nothing but Rūpaka that exists in the exemplified verses and the fallacy of being too wide is not involved in them. (Now), although the said fallacy of being too wide is averted, still, it would be found too wide a definition with regard to the following example of Aprastutapraśaṃsā —

> That extra-ordinary process of the turning of the tongue (also punningly, inconsistency of speech), that insteadiness (also, lightness) of the ears, that sight, which has forgotten its own and others' direction through ichor (also, infatuation), — or what is the use of saying much, O bee, you have forgotten everything, since this elephant (also, this master who turns devoted servants away), whose trunk is hollow inside (also, whose hand is empty), is being inclined to (also, served) (by you) even now. Thus, brother, what obstinacy is this ?

Since, the non-contextual, namely, turning of the tongue by the elephant etc. are useful to the matter in hand,

namely, refraining from rendering service and the like, as being identified with the contextual, namely, inconsistency in speech of the bad master etc. As the insteadiness of ears of the elephant is responsible for refraining from getting inclined towards it by the bee, — it is not so in the case of turning of the tongue and hollowness of the trunk of it (i.e. the elephant). In reverse, it is the attraction toward it, to which ichor is responsible and thus the responsibility for forsaking it is completely turned down. Even in this position, the responsibility for forsaking it, which has been described, is to be accomplished as being identified with the bad master etc. relating to the non-contextuals, namely, elephant etc. Moreover, the same type of fallacy of being too narrow is seen in Pariṇāma exemplified in the verse beginning with 'Suhr̥dālāpenaiva', Since, the face also like the moon is contextual there and thus having no usefulness in being identified with the contextual. Here it is said — in the expression 'prakr̥tātmanā' ('as identi-with the contextual'), the word 'prakr̥ta' ('contextual') denotes only the subject (of description) and thus it would not be too narrow to cover the exemplified verse of Pariṇāma. Usefulness again is intended to be relating to a matter introduced as contextual. In the example of Aprastutapraśaṃsā (mentioned above), usefulness is to the refraining from getting attracted toward the elephant which indicates the contextual, namely, refraining from rendering service to a bad master; (and) thus, there, it would not be too wide a definition.

> If the superimposed exists as identified
> with the subject of superimposition and
> turns to be useful to the contextual —
> it is said to be Pariṇāma.

The above mentioned definition of Vidyānātha, in a like
57 manner, is to be clarified taking the term 'prakṛtasya' as meaning 'prakṛtāgamakasya' (indicating the contextual) as its explanation.

Two-fold is this Pariṇāma again on the basis of its being appositional and non-appositional. An example of (its) being appositional is the following one —

> This (Rāma), himself being the third person (i.e. with two others, namely, Lakṣmaṇa and Sītā), having crossed the heavenly river (i.e. the Ganges), the garland on the head of the lord of creatures (i.e. Śiva), offered help in the form of friendship with Lakṣmaṇa (lit. the son of Sumitrā) to that helmsman as the fare (for carrying), while, for a while, he was looked at with trouble by the young mountaineer women with their breasts being carried with their hands stretched and eyes expanded with astonishment. Then he proceeded towards the mountain Citrakūṭa.

Here, the superimposed, namely, the fare (for carrying), turns to be useful to the description of help towards Guha, as being identified with the friendship of Lakṣmaṇa which happens to be the subject (of description) and thus the figure is Pariṇāma. Because of its sameness of case-terminations, it is a case of being appositional.

An example (of it) being non-appositional, is the following one —

> They, for a pleasure-trip in the forest, made garlands with multitude of white-lotuses (or, flowers from Nāgakeśara tree), girdles with Keyūra (Bakula) flowers and ear-rings with Karṇikā flowers.

Here, the superimposed, namely, garlands etc., are useful to the pleasure-trip in the forest as being identified with the multitude of white-lotuses which happen to be the subjects (of description) and thus the figure is Pariṇāma. Because of its divergence in case-terminations, it is a case of being non-appositional.

This type of being non-appositional is possible in Rūpaka too. For example,

> This obescience is to (that) lord, who has the moon as (his) crest, who is the abode of the universe, whose neck bears the shade of cloud, who has the attachment to the daughter of mountain (i.e. Pārvatī) only as his love-sport (and) who is associated with a crest by way of possessing a river (on his head), with a Tilaka (i.e. a mark of sandal-paste etc. on the forehead) by the (third) eye, with weapons by Nārāyaṇa (i.e. by way of receiving them from Nārāyaṇa), with bracelets by the snakes (and) with a home by the mountain.

Here, the case-termination of 'the river' and 'the eye', the subjects (of description), is lacking in the superimposed, viz., crest and the Tilaka.

Or for example,

> The celebrated king Nṛsiṃha is winning victory on earth giving delight to scholars; -- the king, who is a duplication of cupid, a tautology of the heavenly (wish-yielding) tree, an alternative of the Cintāmaṇi gem, a repetition of Karṇa (lit. born of the body of the sun), twice-mentioning of Indra and duality of the god skilled in the art of destructing the lord of demons.

Here, there is a difference in case-terminations
58 in the subject (of description), namely, the
king and the related, namely, cupid, etc.

Now, what should be the example in the suggestion of Pariṇāma ?

> O Narasiṃha (or the lion-like man) ! the lord of earth ! who are we to describe you, whose fame pervades invading even the region of the moon.

This is the verse which is exemplified by Vidyādhara. Here, what has been said, namely, since by the word 'rāja', the moon is mentioned as the subject, the superimposed, namely, the king, is acknowledged as useful to the description of attack and hence figure Pariṇāma is suggested there, is unjustified; (Since), the superimposed, namely, the king, is useful only as the king and not as the moon. Vidyādhara also has admitted Pariṇāma only when the related, by very nature, is not useful to the matter in hand and for being

useful to which, the related turns identified with the subject. Thus it is said —

> Where the subject (of description) turns to be identified with the object superimposed for its usefulness to the contextual, that, they say, is Pariṇāma which is two-fold.

Vidyānātha again has exemplified it thus —

> This distress of yours would be averted by taking resort to the feet of the king (also, by consuming the rays of the moon). How could dwelling beneath a thorny tree, remove that ?

There is no scope of previously mentioned fallacies here, since, the superimposed, namely, consumption of the rays of the moon, only being identified with the service to the feet of the king, becomes the cause of the cessation of distress, (and) since, the word 'tāpa', though common to the heat of the sun, is desired to mean only the agony caused by the loss of kingdom in this context (and) since, the consumption of the rays of the moon is, by nature, incapable of averting that. Still, this example is in accordance with the view of the ancients. They, in the epithet 'rājapādaniṣevayā', admit the function of suggestion based on the power of words relating to the consumption of the rays of the moon which happen to be the non-contextual owing to restriction by context. In fact, heretoo in the epithet 'rājapādaniṣevayā', expression is the function relating to consumption of the rays of the moon also, since, it has been established by us in the

section on pun that expression is the function of words that prevails even in the meaning of the non-contextual. Thus, since the knowledge of sameness of the two, viz. the contextual and the non-contextual, can be attained by mere rule of proximity as in figures like Atiśayokti, based on pun and since the usefulness to the contextual is attained by the third case-ending, nowhere is there the necessity of the function of suggestion. And thus, this is not an example of the suggestion of Pariṇāma. This fault applies to the previous example also. In fact, the following one may be taken as an example —

> O mind ! for a long time you have endowed agonies. Give up worries. Indeed there exists the cool moon in the form of the
> 59 nail of the lotus-foot of Kṛṣṇa.

Here, by pointing to the existence of the moon-like nail of the lotus-foot of Hari to a person afflicted with grief for a long time, figure Pariṇāma, namely, 'take resort to him only and by that taking resort to him this grief will subside', is suggested. Thus Pariṇāma, as distinguished from Rūpaka, is determined. When the distinction stands as follows — there, in Rūpaka, contextual assumes the form of a non-contextual, whereas in Pariṇāma the non-contextual assumes the form of a contextual, Chakravartin, showed their distinction, which is based on in a different way. In Rūpaka, such as, 'the face is moon', the face, being superimposed as the moon like a cloth (on an object), gets itself concealed by the form of the moon. But in Pariṇāma, such as, 'agony is subsided by the face in the form of the moon', the face

does not have its own self concealed, since, the moon becomes responsible for the alleviation of the pangs of separation in the form of the face only. Thus it is said —

> When there is the concealment of the subject (of description) by way of superimposition of the nature of the related, then in that case the state of the figure Rūpaka (is admitted). There it gives pleasure.
>
> But then it is known as Pariṇāma when the subject (of description), without any deviation from its own nature attains the form of that (i.e. Viṣayin) for its usefulness (toward the description in hand).

This has to be considered here — in Rūpaka, concealment of the subject (of description) is not in the disappearance of its (own) form; since the disappearance of the subject (of description), owing to the artificial superimposition, is not possible as in the case of the nature of pearl-oyster through mistake of silver. In Śārīraka (Bhāṣya) also, with this apprehension (in view), viz., that the nature of the function of the chanting (of the Sāmaveda), like the nature of the pearl-oyster while the sight has silver as its object, would disappear if the chanting, in the expression — "one should worship that, which scatter rays, as Udgītha", is taken as the object of the sight of the sun, — it has been stated that the sight superimposed is incapable of causing disappearance (of the subject). ~~Nor is~~ there is not ~~a~~ subordination (of the (Viṣaya) to the Viṣayin also. The same is admitted in Pariṇāma

too. Since in both the cases the Mayūravyaṃsaka class of compound, where the meaning of the last member is predominant, remains the same. Hence, the interpretation, that 'sthagana' (concealment) is being qualified by the Viṣayin, is also turned down, since the Viṣayin (itself) is qualified. Therefore, supportless is the statement relating to the distinction based on concealment and non-concealment and hence the distinction of Pariṇāma from Rūpaka is to be endorsed as based only on the usefulness relating to the subject (of description). Enough of elaboration.

Here ends the section on the figure Pariṇāma.

-: oOo :-

Now begins the figure 'Doubtful' ('Sasandeha').

That knowledge of the non-contextual matter, which involves no ascertainment and appears
60 as based on the contextual matter owing to similarity, is considered to be Doubtful (Sasandeha) by the experts.

And this Sasandeha is of three types, namely, Pure, Containing Certainty in the Middle and Ending in Certainty. Examples follow in order —

O the crest-jewel of kings ! having brought the wealth of enemies (conquered by you) in the forest and seen in them an excessively white small-basket which was (like a) piece of a lunar digit, the

> foolish mountaineers could not determine whether it was a musical instrument, or a pounding apparatus, or some wealth, or a throwable weapon, or a celestial object.
>
> Is this the Sun ? — But the Sun is accompanied by seven horses. Is this fire ? — Surely, fire never flames on all sides. Is this the Death-God ? — But he has the buffalo as his conveyance. Thus, O king, on seeing you in battle, do your enemies entertain various doubts.
>
> Is it a lotus or the face of a young woman noticed in the lake at a distance ? Having doubted (this) for a while, someone, through the gestures not to be noticed in lotuses (lit. those which stay in water along with cranes), arrived certainty.

This is what they say. Here this has to be considered — whether the fifth case-ending in the expression 'Sāmyāt' ('owing to similarity'), is intended to convey the causality in the form of a result as is noticed in 'annāddhetorvasati' ('one dwelling for food'), or to denote the causality as such. In the former case, it would mean the result in the form of conveying similarity with the non-contextual. In that case, it would be too narrow to cover the example beginning with 'ānīya dviṣatām'. There is no poetic effort in conveying similarity of the small-basket with moon-like appearance, with musical instrument etc. On the other hand it has (the same) in

expressing the abundance of prowess of the king (by way of indicating that) the enemy's city reached such a (pitiable) condition. In the second case, the question arises — whether one single simile with the non-contextual as responsible for beautification of all included in the side of doubt or an irregularity of being one or many, is intended (here) by the expression 'sāmyāt'. In the former, it would be too narrow to cover the example beginning with 'ayaṃ mārtaṇḍaḥ kim'; Since, it is not so here that a single simile is the cause of the doubt to the state of (being) the sun etc., as is the simile of abundance of beauty in the doubt of Lakṣmī etc. to be found in the expression "Is this Lakṣmī, or Urvaśī, or Rambhā, or Menakā ?" But owing to prowess simile of being looked at with trouble ~~owing to excessive heat~~ is the cause in the doubt of being the sun; simile of being unassailable is the cause in the doubt of being fire; simile of being destroyer of all in a moment is the cause in the doubt of being Death-God. In the second case, it would be too wide with regard
61 to the figure Vikalpa (Uncertainty) (as noticed) in "Bow your head down here (i.e. on the feet of the king) like the king of Kaliṅga or (bend your) bow like (the king of) Karahāṭa in the beginning of battle."

Since, there exists a knowledge of uncertainty here caused by setting example of that king in the timely direction of a reliable person, namely, bow your head in that manner the king of Kaliṅga, having followed the policy, viz.

> When attacked by a (more) powerful (king), take resort to the reed-like attitude and never the serpentine, if want your fortune unhurt.

bent his head down without any hesitation with a view to avert the sure destruction of the fortune of his own kingdom, or bend your bow in such a manner as did the king of Karahāṭa having followed the policy, viz. "Through victory, wealth is achieved, through death the celestial woman", bend (his) bow having accepted the challenge, while the powerful king, engaged in (his) conquest of directions, entered in battle. It is unjustified to say that, there, in the verse, the fallacy of being too wide is not involved for the absence of such knowledge; since, if inclusion of that (knowledge) also is desired to be included in the definition, the question of being too narrow to cover the examples of suggested Sasandeha which are based on doubtful object as in the following one and the like, would arise.

> Youngest or eldest, wickeds are like a machine for raising water. They are bowing at the time of collecting livelihood (and) having received (it) elevated again (just as a machine for raising water goes downward at the time of lifting water but goes upward after taking it).

For, heretoo, the twofold nature based on the divisions, viz., the expressed and the suggested, like the varieties, namely, the expressed and the suggested in the case of Utprekṣā, has to be admitted, because two types of examples are noticeable.

Moreover, what is meant by 'anavadhāraṇā' ? If it be said that this consists in uncertainty, then it would

be found too-wide a definition with regard to the verse beginning with 'Bālenduvaktrāṇyavikāśabhāvāt' to be exemplified as an example of Utprekṣā consisting in probability of identity with that (i.e. non-contextual) based on the similarity with the non-contextual, since probability consists of doubt on two opposite sides. If it be maintained that this consists in (a knowledge) resting in many mutually-contradictory aspects, then also it would be too-wide (a definition) with regard to Rūpaka as in 'Moon in the form of a face'. If it is said that this is intended as consisting in (a knowledge) resting in many aspects mentioned as mutually opposite through contradiction, then also it would be too-wide a definition with regard to Apahnuti to be exemplified in the verse beginning with 'aṅkaṃ ke'pi śaśaṃkire'. Since, theretoo, a mutually opposition is established by way of presenting respective opinions in a manner (the same is established) by the word 'vā' in case of doubt or uncertainty. It would be too narrow to cover the following example of Sasandeha also.

In the creating of this woman, was the
position of the creator occupied by the
Moon, the source of effulgence ? Or was
it the Love-god himself abounding in the
62 erotic passion ? Or was it the
season of spring ? How else
could the ancient sage, whose sensibility
had been deadened by Vedic study and whose
interest had been withdrawn from all objects,
be able to create such a heart-ravishing
body ?

Since, it lacks in possessing (a knowledge) resting in many aspects, as plurality rests only in the moon etc. possessing an attribute connected with doubt and everywhere the attribute, namely, the state of being the creator of (that) woman, the subject of description, remains 'one' only. It would be unjustified to say that, as the doubt in the expression "Don't know, where, whether to (her) home or to my heart, she has gone herefrom", is not taken (as a case of this figure), (similarly), owing to the lack of being caused by similarity, the figure is not Sasandeha there. Since, based on the point, namely, the heroine to be described, possesses similarity with the moon in point of (her) charm and similarity with the flower in point of (her) fragrance and tenderness, the doubt, namely, whether the moon, the store of beauty, on account of its (own) wealth of charm, or the spring on account of its (own) wealth of flower, is the creator of this (heroine), is described and since the state of being caused by that (doubt) has not been rejected in the portion involving the moon and the spring although the portion 'śṛṅgāraikarasaḥ svayaṃ nu madanaḥ' ends in the indication of the abundance of amorous movements only and is not based on any similarity.

Similarly, the expression 'prakṛtārthāśrayā' also is unjustified (to include), since, it would be too narrow to cover the doubt as exemplified above, as it is not based on the subject of description, namely, the heroine. Here we say —

That is known as the figure Sandeha where the knowledge, based on similarity (and)

connected with the meaning of the word 'vā' ('or'), pertains to many objects rejecting one another from all aspects.

Although the state of pertaining to many contradictory objects rejecting one another, exists in the figure Vikalpa also, still, there is found not the mutual rejection of those objects from all aspects, but the state of barring the scope for an alternative, opposed to itself, in the form of an alternative making room for itself without barring the scope for that on the other side. It is not so that in the direction of alternation in (the vedic injunction), namely, "Sacrifice has to be made either by rice or by barley", rice rejects barley and barley rejects rice from (their application) in the sacrifice from all aspects; since, if it be admitted, the question of non-authority of the Shastras would arise owing to its failing to give any verdict for holding the sacrifice because of its lack of determination. But only the respective alternative performances are prescribed here. This is why, to a person asking through doubt, "Vrīhibhir|yavair|vā yaṣṭavyam" ("Should I sacrifice with rice or barley"), the sentence in the very form of the question, namely, "Vrīhibhir|yavair|vā yaṣṭavyam" ("You may sacrifice either with rice or with barley") is seen as the answer to it being the remover of doubt lying at the root of the question and a directive for holding the performance; since, there is a distinction like this — in the sentence in the form of question the word 'vā' is used for rejecting from all aspects another possibility, (whereas) in the sentence in the form of answer, it is meant for rejecting that alternatively. Similarly, it would not be too-wide a

definition with regard to the figure Vikalpa; since, in the example of the figure Vikalpa also, as both the two scriptural policies are authoritative and hence both the two are justified to be followed in accordance with the respective desire for result mentioned there, — bendings of the head and the bow down, do not reject each other from all aspects. Although there exists rejection of each other from all aspects in the instance of Apahnava, it would not be too wide a definition; since it is not associated with the meaning of the word 'vā'. Since, there, (in the
63 instance of Apahnava) one understands the rejection of each other of the possibilities through the mention of variant opinions with expressions like 'kecit', 'anye' and there is no connection with the meaning of the word 'vā'. It would not involve the fallacy of being too-wide with regard to Utprekṣā also; since, it is not connected with the meaning of 'vā', because, in that figure where one possibility is stronger, there is a lack of the possession of equal strength of the two alternatives relating to doubt. Although, the example (beginning with) 'Asyāḥ sargavidhau' is not based on many possibilities which negate one another, (still), it would not lead to the fallacy of being too-narrow, since, it is based on meanings in the form of many such 'dharmins' (qualifieds). Faultless is thus everything (here).

An example of the suggestion of the figure Sandeha is the following one found in Varadarājavasantotsava, composed by Vakṣaḥsthalācārya, who is the origin of our family —

> Having seen a woman of golden complexion who appeared like Lakṣmī incarnate, Lord Barada (i.e. Viṣṇu) was doubtful and looked at his chest.

Here, although the doubt is expressed in word, still, that much does not constitute the figure. (and) hence (it is a case of Sandeha). There is a suggestion of the figure Sandeha, since, the expression leading to that figure, namely, Lakṣmī, residing in that very chest, having descended therefrom is standing before, which assumes the form of a doubt, is being suggested by the expression, namely, he looked at his chest. Another example is the following one —

> (She), having seen behind her own reflection the reflection of (her) lover, seated behind, while, on the mirror, she was looking at the signs of sexual enjoyment (on her person), acted in various manners out of bashfulness.

Though the word 'lajjā' has been used for conveying the external manifestation of a particular feeling, indicated in general by the expression 'kāni kānyapi', that (bashfulness) has a suggestion, namely, revealation leading to Rasa by means of the relevant Vibhāva (excitant) sentiment and Anubhāva (ensuant). Although by the expression 'vakṣaḥsthalam avaikṣata' suggestions of various doubts, contained in the expression 'saṃśayāpannaḥ', are possible, such as — being in doubt as to whose beauty, between Lakṣmī and the woman seen in the front, is more, or being in doubt as to how does Lakṣmī, proud of possessing peerlessly excessive beauty, stand (even now) beholding her in the front, or being in doubt as to where to place this (woman) in my chest. Still, since all the doubts are based on similarity, it is quite justified to take it as an example of the suggestion of the figure Sandeha (and this would have been

the case) even if a Sandeha with Vyatireka at its root be possible here since that too is somehow based on similarity.

Here ends the section on the figure Sandeha.

-: oOo :-

Now begins the determination of Bhrāntimān ( Error ).

64 That is known as Bhrāntimān (Error) where there is a knowledge of the superimposed on the subject (of description) which is concealed owing to similarity, agreeable to the poets.

Because of the expression 'pihitātmani', it is intended that the knwoledge of the superimposed should be a charming imagination due to poetic faculty, since, that only can conceal the subject (of description). Thus it would not be too wide with regard to Rūpaka etc. An example (of the figure Bhrāntimān) is the following one —

A cat mistakes the rays of the moon for milk in a potsherd and licks them. An elephant grasps them as they enter through the interstices of a tree mistaking them for lotus-fibres. At the end of amorous sports, the lady-love mistakes them to be the silken garment and removes them. Look, the moon full of lustres, is deluding this world.

Since the description has led to the act of licking etc., here, charming is the error, which has been described

to suggest the exuberence of moon-light through poetic faculty.

Somewhere, charm arises out of gradual elaboration of an error.

> O Ballāla ! the protector of earth ! a Kirāta woman, moving in the city of your enemy, having collected the scattered gems, became doubtful of a big charcoal of khadira-tree (and) having thrown sandal-wood on them and blown into (that), (she), with her eyes closed, doubts of smoke on the groups of bees following the perfume of breaths.

Somewhere charm arises out of gradual presentation of errors belonging to different agents.

> The couple of pitcher-like breasts were kissed by the humming bees taking them as filaments (of flowers); hands, having graceful movements arising out of fear from them, were stung by parrots taking them as tender leaves; (they), while making sounds for driving them out, were oppressed by the host of crows taking (the sounds) to be the cries of the cuckoo. Thus, O the lion-like king of the Cholas, even the forest is not fit for shelter for your fawn-eyed enemy-women.

Somewhere (charm arises) out of the mention of errors mutually related. For example —

The bee perches on the beak of the parrot mistaking it for a Palāśa-bud. So also does it attempt to pick up the bee mistaking it for a (black-) berry.

While your fame is in its spread on the
65 surface of the earth, — Vidhiḥ
(i.e. Brahmā), Vaikuṇṭhaḥ (i.e.
Hari) and Śaṃkaraḥ (i.e. Śiva) wish to
ascend, lay down and reside on it (respec-
tively).

Here the figure Bhrāntimān is suggested.

When the doubt and error are based on something other than similarity, then they do not lead to the figure Sasandeha and Bhrāntimān. For example —

The daring Cupid, furnishing his bow with arrows in order to conquer him, who was self-restrained, staked even his fame (already) attained by conquering the three worlds.

The wrestler Cāṇūra, with his heavy chest smashed by punches from Dāmodara (i.e. Krishna) saw the sky with a hundred moons.

In the first example, the doubt in respect of the loss of fame, arises out of bravery showed in venturing to conquer a hard-to-win battle. In the second, the error (in seeing a hundred) moons, is due to the heavy punch on the breast.

Here ends the section on Bhrāntimān.

-: oOo :-

Figure Ullekha (Allusion) is now being determined.

> That is called Ullekha (Allusion) which consists in the mention of a single object variously by many on various grounds.

That is Ullekha, where a single object, possessed of many (characteristic) properties, is mentioned in various ways by many perceivers on various grounds in the form of possession of various properties.

> (You are) the Himācala for the Ganges in the form of your fame; the Rising mountain for the sun in the form of your vigour; the churning mountain for the ocean in the form of (your) enemy-force and the only sprout for the gems in the form of (your) qualities.

Here, in the above instance of Mālārūpaka, there is a mention of a king in various ways like the state of being a snowy mountain, on account of divergence in grounds in the form of connection with properties like the state of being a famous and to avoid the fallacy of being too-wide (a definition) (noticed) there, the expression 'aneka' is used. There, the mention in various ways is not due to the divergence in perceivers and hence the fallacy of being too-wide is not involved.

> The wise, heroes, women and the old are beholding (him), who has arrived (here), with wonder as the receptacle of learning, valour, beauty and penance.

Here, there is a mention of a (single) subject of description by many perceivers owing to the divergence of ground in the form of connection with various properties

like learning and hence to avert there the fallacy of being too-wide (a definition), the expression 'anekadhā' is used. There the mention is due to beholding as such out of wonder

66 only and not in various ways and thus (a verse like) this is excluded. In series of errors belonging to many agents, which is cited an example (of Bhrāntimān) in the verse (beginning with) "śiñjānair mañjarīti stanakalaśa-yugaṃ cumbitaṃ cañcarīkaiḥ", there is mention of the breasts etc., in various ways like the state of filament etc. by many like the bees owing to divergence in grounds like the similarity with filament, and to avert the fallacy of being too-wide (a definition) there, the term 'ekasya vastunaḥ' has been used.

> While your fame is spreading, both the Nāgas i.e., the elephant and the snake, taking them as lotus-stalk and milk (respectively), extend their tongues repeatedly.

In this example of Bhrāntimān, there is a mention of the self-same fame in various ways like the state of lotus-stalk and milk by many perceivers, namely, the elephant and the snake and to avert the fallacy of being too-wide (a definition) here, the expression 'nimittabhedāt' has been used. Here one single thing, namely, whiteness belonging to fame lies at the root of both the two. Though there exists divergence of grounds in the form of greed for respective favourite food of the elephant and the snake, still, since the absence of one (single) ground is desired by the expression 'nimittabhedāt', this (above verse) would be excluded (automatically). If this is to be included, the expression 'nimittabhedāt' would result in

the mere statement of nature. Even in this position, if, as in the following example of a variety of Apahnuti, fallacy of being too-wide is doubted, then the (mention of) 'anekadhā ullekhaṇam' has to be adjuncted by 'niṣedhā-spṛṣṭa' i.e., 'not touched by any negation'.

> Some took (your face) to be the moon on account of beauty; others took it to be the lotus owing to (its) fragrance; we say, your face has attained an identity with both by firtue of penance.

There, the first two mentions, possess suggested negation by virtue of presentation of the state of others' opinion and hence the fallacy of being too-wide is not involved.

> He was taken as the lord Kāma by the women, the heavenly tree by the supplicants, (and) the Death-god by the enemies.

Here, in the mention in various ways, love, the state of a supplicant, fear and the like are the factors in respective ways leading (to the figure). 'Ruci' means love for something. 'Arthitva' is greed. This Ullekha again is of two types — Pure and Mixed with other figures. Of them, an example of Pure is the following one —

> Lord Śauri (i.e. Śrīkṛṣṇa) was looked at with wonder as the protector of elephant by the old-aged women, as the lover of Lakṣmī by the youthful ladies, as possessing the usual form by girls.

Here, while entering in the city, Kṛṣṇa was looked at by the old-aged women, seeking protection from him due to the fear of the cycle (of birth), thinking that this is that Primeval Being who promptly saved the afraid and devoted elephant in that manner; (he) was looked at with eagerness by the youthful ladies thinking that this is that divine youngman who for his skillfullness in amorous sporting
67 is permanently dear even to Laxmī, who is noted for (her) fickleness; (he) was looked at as having his usual form and garment by the girls because of their childish nature. Thus, since everywhere the same object has been mentioned in various ways, this is Pure. Or for example, (the following passage) in the description of the land of Śrīkaṇṭha, in the Harṣacarita, may be considered.

> (The land), which was taken as a hermitage by the sages, the home of Kāma by courtesans, a concert-hall by actors, the city of death by foes, the philosopher's stone by the supplicants, the soil of the heroes by the professional soldiers, the preceptor's home by the aspirants to knowledge, the city of Gandharvas by the singers, the Great Artificer's temple by the scientists, the land of profit by the merchants, the gaming house by the bards, the gathering of the virtuous by the good men, the cage of adamant by the refugees, the Rogue's Meet by the clevers, the reward of their good deeds by the wayfarers, the cave of demons by the Vāhīkas, the Buddhist monastery by the quietists, the

> Apsaras' City by the lovers, the festival congress by the troubadours, the stream of wealth by the Brahmins.

Here, the mention as hermitage etc., due to the abundance of hermitage and the like, is Pure. In the very same passage, mention of the state of the city of the Death-god etc. is Mixed. If the syntax of the state of the city of the Death-god etc. is as the beautifier only, then, there the mixture is with Rūpaka. Then it is a mixture with Bhrāntimān if (they are mentioned) as the expressive of the knowledge of identity. This Ulleka again, with a view to express superiority of qualities belonging to the subject of description, is found to be applied with non-animates as agents also. For example, in that very book, in the description of Harṣa —

> Single as he lay there, he was he was taken with different lights (by different spectators); — riches called him cold, all faults turned from him as inaccessible, the senses felt awed at his love of self-control, the genius of the iron age said 'he is beyond my reach', all vices pronounced him as passionless, dishonour looked him as timid, Love said, 'the workings of his mind are hard to be understood'; Sarasvatī complained that 'he is uxorious', others' wives that 'he is imponent', ascetics said that 'he is a seer of the highest order', harlots that 'he is a deceiver', friends took him to be submissive, Brahmins considered him a servant, the enemy soldiers took him as helpless.

In a similar manner, figures like Bhrānti-
68 mān also, are applied with inanimates as agents. (For example) –

> Here, the lotus-beds, thinking that it must be the sun (risen) even at night, had their lotuses in bloom while the rays of the moon mingled with various types of rays (emitting) from gems attained thousand-fold in number.

> The black-bees, eager for honey, and the thirsty Cakora birds are running after the fragrant and lustrous face of yours.

Here the figure Ullekha is suggested. In the verse beginning with 'vidyāvikramasaundarya', if (the meaning) does not culminate in the ground for the mere eagerness for the observation of the nature of learning etc., but culminates in the ground for the eagerness for observation like the mention of the state of learned etc., then, therealso the figure Ullekha would be suggested, because, the particular charm created by the state of being mentioned in various ways is suggested.

> With regard to a single woman, a mendicant, a libidinous person and a dog, have three different ideas; namely, a corpse, a loving woman and a food respectively.

That herealso figure Ullekha is desired, is not a case of the fallacy of being too-wide a definition.

There is another variety of Ullekha.

> Even in the absence of the divergence of perceivers, mention of a single (object) in various ways on thebasis of divergence of subject (of description) and receptacle also, is styled as Ullekha.

Of these, the mention in various ways on the basis of divergence of subject (of description) may be Pure and Mixed. An example of Pure (is the following one) —

> May the good fortune (in the form of Pārvatī) of the compassionate skull-bearing lord (i.e. Śiva) reside in the mind — (the goddess) who is stout at the chest but thin at the waist, big in the eyes but broadened at the hips and with lips that are ruddy.

> He is weighty (also, Bṛhaspati) in speech, vast (also Pṛthu, the king) in chest, broad (also, Viśāla, the king) in mind, source (also, Janaka, the king) of penance, sun (also, Sumitra, the king) in prowess, a good counsel (also Sumantra, the king) in consultation, a learned in the court (also, Buddha in host of luminaries), Arjuna (also, white) in fame, the dreadful (also, Bhīṣma) in arrows. .....

In these cases and the like (the figure) is mixed with pun.

> In her movements (she is) as if a swan; in conversation, as if a cuckoo; in the love

towards husband, as if a Cakravāka bird;
in the expansion of breasts (also, in the
heaps of clouds), as if the rainy-season;
in the collection of treasures (also, in
the combination of petals), as if the lotus;
in yielding fruits, as if the flowers.

These are cases of (Ullekha) mixed with the figure Utprekṣā. In the expression 'payodharonnatau' etc., in the portion of the subject (of description) (it is) again mixed with pun. In examples like "Yudhiṣṭhira in speaking the truth" etc., it is mixed with Rūpaka.

The figure is mixed with Upamā in examples like "Like Yudhiṣṭhira in speaking the truth". These and the like have to be understood.

69 An example of the mention in various ways on the basis of divergence in receptacles, is the following one —

May that (Vāmana) protect you from mis-
haps. (Vāmana), the thriving, the slayer
of Bali (and) whose movements consisted
in three steps, on whose person the sun,
for a while, acted as an umbrella, on
head — a jewel, on forehead — a Tilaka
(i.e. a mark of sandal paste etc.), at the
end of ears — a (couple of) rings, on the
shoulder — a disc, on the chest — the
excellent (Kaustubha) gem, on the navel —
the Lotus-seated (Brahmā) (and) on the
feet — a (couple of) bracelets.

Here, it is mixed with Rūpaka. Again, Ullekha is mixed on the ground of divergence in perceivers standing in front of particular parts of bodies, namely, the middle of the forehead, end of the ears and the like of the lord. Since, a single perceiver cannot see the sun at the middle of the forehead and at the end of the ears.

> In the seraglios of slain rivals, his prowess was, as it were, materialised in the form of the five elements; fire in the hearts (of women), water in the hollows of their eyes, wind in their sighs, earth upon their forms (and) ether in the vacant solitude.

Here, the figure Hetu consists in the expression of identity of prowess with the effects of prowess in the form of heat, vapour and the like which are understood (here) from the words 'vahni', 'jala' etc., and thus there is a mixture with that (i.e. the figure Hetu). In the opinion of others, there is a mixture with Rūpaka.

> Let those lustres of the throat of Śrīkaṇṭha (i.e. Śiva) do good to you; (lustres), which act as the Tilaka (i.e. a mark of the sandle-paste etc.) of Kasturī i.e. musk on the forehead of the goddess; act as black-bees on her lotus-like face; act as a crest of tender Tamāla leaves on her head and act as bloomed lotuses on the ears; and which will stay as black Agaru (i.e. a type of scent) on a part (i.e. the nipple, in this case) of the breast.

Here the figure is mixed with Upamā. Some say — though the suffix Kvip is added in the sense of simile, it pulminates in a sense of Utprekṣā in the light of the possibility of identity with the Tilaka of musk etc., owing to the propriety of particular receptacles and hence the figure is Utprekṣā which in the beginning has a sense of Upamā. In that opinion, this is mixed with Utprekṣā. In the same manner, amalgamation with other figures has to be understood.

Here ends the section on Ullekha.

-: oOo :-

Now begins Apahnuti (Denial).

> That is Apahnuti, where the state of something else is established owing to similarity, with a denial of the object under description. It is divided into two, — having many sentences and having one sentence.

In Rūpaka, there is only the establishment of something else. In Ākṣepa (Paralepsis), as in "I am not a messenger, but the excessive physical agonies of the fair-limbed one (incarnate)" (?), only the denial of the object of description is there. Both the cases are not adjuncted with similarity. Still, it would be too wide a definition with
70 regard to Atiśayokti as in "Cupid is not five-arrowed, but has more than five arrows," and hence it has been mentioned as qualified (by 'anyatva-prakalpanam'). It would be unjustified to say that it would be too wide a definition with regard to Tattvākhyānopamā

as in "This is not a lotus, but obviously the face", as it possesses the denial of the state of a lotus and the establishment of the state of a face (as well). Since, the word 'prakalpana' means superimposition. The definition is not mentioned with the suffix 'ktvā' (as would run) — 'niṣidhya viṣayaṃ sāmyād anyāropaḥ' i.e., 'having denied the object under description, superimposition of (something else) based on similarity .....'. Since, the question of being too narrow to cover the case of denial preceeded by superimposition, the illustration of which will be given later, would arise.

This figure, having many sentences, is seen in the use of particles like 'nañ' denoting direct negation, in the presentation of others' opinion etc. and in the suggestion of denial by implication. (And the same figure), having one sentence, (is seen) in the use of words like 'chadma', 'nibha', 'kapaṭa', 'vyāja' ('in the guise of'), denoting falsehood of the object (under description) and in the use of words like 'rūpa', 'nāma', 'bhaṅgī' ('in the form of') ultimately conveying the falsehood of the object of description.

Of these, in (the variety, namely,) 'having many sentences', there are two divisions — viz., superimposition preceeded by denial and denial preceeded by superimposition.

Examples follow in order —

O daughter of the mountain, this is
certainly not the spot (of the moon), which,
having attained prominence, is shinning on
the body of the moon, whose splendour is

fully developed. I think this is the beautiful lady in the form of the night, who,being fatigued with enjoyment, is sleeping soundly on his chest, cool owing to the flow of trickling nectar.

Or for example —

This is not the sky, but the ocean; these are not stars, but the fragments of fresh foam; this is not the moon, but the lord of serpents (i.e. śeṣanāga) with a coiled tail; this is not the lord of serpents but lord Murāri is laid down (there).

In the former, Apahnuti is partless, (whereas) here it is possessed of parts, — this is the distinction.

Some have supposed (it to be) a spot; others have thought (it to be) ocean's mud; some have called (it) a dappled antelope; others wished (to see in it) earths' shadow. What is always seen in the moon black as a chip of split supphire, we declare (to be) thick, densest darkness drunk in the night (and) remaining in (his) belley.

Here also superimposition is preceeded by denial. And the denial is implied by way of presenting others' views.

That Kumāra (i.e. Kārtikeya) may shower
71 on you the wealth of celebacy — Kumāra, who ever resides in the heaps of blooming blue-lotuses in the form

> of the eyes of the heavenly women which were made downwards by the control (over senses) and who does not sit on the beautiful praiseworthy peacock.

Here, the denial preceeded by superimposition is expressed in words.

> The mark of sore, caused by the friction of thousands of stones at the foot of the churing mountain, is seen in the moon. (But) this is a blindly following belief of the foolish in this world, that it is the shadow (of the earth), (or) a deer, (or) a hare.

Here also, the denial is preceeded by superimposition. That again is established by the implication of presentation of the statements of the fools. These are the examples 'involving many sentences'. Examples 'involving one sentence' are the following —

> Alas, friend, see how much is this enmity of Cupid towards people in love, who have grown emaciated owing to separation from their lovers. Under the guise of the bees shinning on the mango-blossoms in the garden, he has displayed the deadly poison on every arrow.

> Verily, the love-god, scorched by Śiva, has fallen upon the plump thighs of the fawn-eyed one, — which are like the tank of the nectar of loveliness; as from the hole

of her naval, there is proceeding a line of smoke in the form of the line of hair, indicating the extinction of the charcoal of his body.

In the former, (the idea) that these are not the mango-leaves with black-bees but arrows with the deadly poison, is understood by virtue of the word 'chala' which is expressive of falsehood. In the latter, (the idea) that this is not the line of hair but line of smoke, is understood by virtue of the word 'vapuḥ' which ultimately conveys falsehood.

Some admit the figure Apahnuti even in the description of similarity for the sake of denial as in the case of denial for conveying similarity. As they say —

> That is Apahnuti where there is a denial
> for conveying similarity. This is also
> Apahnuti where there is a (description of)
> similarity for the sake of denial.

And they give examples —

> Such is dear to me (also, such is my beloved)
> which (also, who) catches at my lock of hair
> tightly at first, then presses face to face,
> 72 fair-necked which (also, who)
> claps my neck and bodily enfolds
> my breasts; that finally having hugged my
> hips falls on my feet." "My child, you
> have lost all shame". "No, no; O the crooked-
> minded (lit. simple-minded), what's shameful
> in a bodice?

Here, having denied the lover, which is desired to be mentioned, there has been a superimposition of the state of a bodice. And for that purpose, there has been the presentation of common-property between the lover and bodice beforehand. Admittance of Apahnuti here is in accordance with the opinion of Udbhaṭa and others who do not admit Vyājokti (Statement of Pretext) as a separate figure of speech. Those who like Vyājokti as a separate figure (and define it thus) -- "concealing something which has somehow been expressed, is (the figure) Vyājokti", -- to them, it is the figure Vyājokti that exists here also and not the figure Apahnuti. This is what Rucaka and others say. But Daṇḍin, being regardless of the rule of similarity at the root with regard to Apahnuti defined it thus -- 'Apahnuti is nothing but the presentation of something else after denying something,' and exemplified ~~it~~ it thus --

> Where something is denied and another
> meaning is made clear, then it is
> Apahnuti. Cupid is not a person with
> five arrows; his arrows are a thousand.
>
> Sandal, moonshine and the fragrant southern
> breeze ~~which carries fragrance~~ -- their
> nature, (so far as I am concerned,) is full
> of fire; so far as other are concerned,
> it is cool.
>
> The moon possesses rays which shed nectar;
> -- this is not my opinion. On the other
> hand, it is different and has rays which
> shed poison profusely.

Apahnuti, based on similarity has been named Upamāpahnuti by him.

> In the portrait of yours that was painted by a slim girl who was restless out of curiosity, a girl painted (on it) the disc and the Garuḍa bird too. Again, another girl, with her sweating palm, having rubbed it quickly, painted on it the flowery arrow on hand and shark on top.

Suggestion of Apahnuti may be exemplified in the above verse and the like. Here, the idea, viz., this is not an ordinary man but the 'lotus-eyed' (Viṣṇu), — has been suggested by some girl through the painting of the disc and the Garuḍa bird. But another girl suggested that this is not the 'lotus-eyed' (Viṣṇu) but Cupid by rubbing out both those (marks) and by painting flowery arrows and shark on banner, with the intention that such a beauty is not possible even in him (i.e. Viṣṇu).

Here ends the section on Apahnuti.

-: oOo :-

Now begins the figure Utprekṣā (Poetical Fancy).

> The wise call it Utprekṣā (Poetical Fancy)
> 73 where the contextual is conjectured as something other (than that) owing to (its) relation to another property.

For example —

> The excessively crimson Palāśa buds, arched as the crescent moon since not fully bloommed, shone like the nail-marks of the regions of forest just united with spring.

Here the contextuals, viz. the Palāśa flowers, are conjectured as the nail-marks because of their connection with archedness and redness, which are the properties of the non-contextual, namely, the nail-marks. 'Tarka' means mere possibility and not ascertainment, since the property of that (i.e. the 'Tarka') is the cause of mere possibility of identity with that and not the cause of ascertainment having an evidence which is associated with universal pervasion and the subject of a syllogism. One should not doubt that the figure is Upamā here since the word 'iva' indicates similarity, since, Upamā can be admitted with nail-marks found anywhere and (thus) does not depend on the imagination of an adjunct, which is connected with the region of a forest united with spring as the hero, since, adjunct like that becomes befitting only in the possibility of identity of Palāśa-buds with the nail-marks. Similarly, in other cases also, wherever exists an imagination of an appropriate adjunct in the (imagination of) possibility of identity with the non-contextual, figure Utprekṣā is to be acknowledged invariably. For example —

She, with her creeper-like body, had the braid (of hair) resembling the lines of hornets, which, when loosened on the back, looked as if reflected on account of (its) clearness.

Upamā can be admitted with a braid found anywhere and hence the imagination of the adjunct, viz., the state of being reflected in the front on account of clearness, which is not necessary here, is meant for the possibility of identity. But where a comparison, devoid of the imagination of an adjunct applicable to possibility, is presented, there the term 'iva' indicates similarity and hence the figure is Upamā. With this division in view, Chakravartin has said, "Where the element of comparison is well-known among the people", etc., Daṇḍin too, has said of the suggestion of Utprekṣā from the word 'iva' —

Figure Utprekṣā is suggested by the word 'manye' ('I think'), 'śaṃke' ('I doubt'), 'dhruvam' ('definitely'), 'prāyaḥ' ('mostly'), 'nūnam' ('surely') etc. The word 'iva' also is similar to those.

Here by the word 'ādi', words like 'tarkayāmi' ('I surmise'), 'sambhāvayāmi' ('I think it possible'), 'jāne' ('I know'), 'utprekṣe' ('I imagine'), 'syāt' ('may be') are included. Here again, to avert the fallacy of being too wide with regard to the following verses and the like, the expression 'dharmasambandhāt' has been used.

Had I been the Lord Brahmā, I would have
74 put the entire amount of the quality of small on the tongue of the wicked, having collected it from

the testicles of the musk-deer.

> Had the fire been not hot, had the water
> been not cool, — then only I would admit
> that the firm Rāma should be untruthful.

In those (examples), which are cases of the figure Atiśayokti following the (definition) — "Yadyarthoktam ca kalpanam" etc., or of the figure Sambhāvanā following the definition "That is to be known as the figure Sambhāvānā, where for the establishment of the other i.e. the non-contextual, there is a doubt in the form of a question «Had it been so» ", baseless is the relevant doubt. Still, it would be too wide a definition with regard to the following example and the like and to avert that, the expression 'anyadharmasambandhāt' has been used —

> I think, the face of Satyavān possesses
> all-surpassing beauty by which the fawn-
> eyed Sāvitrī was moved.

In these examples, the doubt is raised on the basis of its own property, such as, the state of being the agent for rendering the heart of Sāvitrī moved and hence there will be no fallacy of being too-wide.

> Since the dust of the earth as ruddy as the
> crimson twilight, is raising up before me,
> I think, Bharata, to whom the news of (my
> arrival) has been communicated by Hanūmān,
> is coming up to me with his army.

To avoid the fallacy of being too-wide with regard to this, there is the adjunct 'anyatvena'. Here, while

arriving with army, Bharata is doubted as arrived in fact on the basis of a relation of the rising of dust before, which is seen in other (similar) occasions too and not otherwise; hence, fallacy of being too wide is not involved.

> O Narasiṃha, the protector of earth, people
> know you as Cupid incarnate. Otherwise,
> how do your arrows turn into flowers ?

To avert the fallacy of being too wide with regard to the present case, (the adjunct) 'upatarkitam' has been mentioned. Here, in the case of the figure Anumāna, the state of Cupid in the king is determined on the basis of a liṅga (sign), namely, the state of the possession of flowery arrows which has an invariable connection with the state of the Cupid and not the mere doubt (is here).

> In the presence of Sītā, the moon seems
> to be smeared with collyrium; the eyes
> of gazells dull, the creeper-like coral,
> as if has its redness dimmed; the brilli-
> ance of gold darkened; in voice there is,
> as if, a little hardness in the throats
> of female cuckoos; the tail of peacocks
> are full of censure indeed.

To avert the fallacy of being too wide with regard to the present case, (the term) 'prakṛta' has been mentioned.

75 Here, the conjecture of inferiority by means of (the description) like smearing with collyrium, on the non-contextuals, namely, the moon etc., which are famous as standards of comparison, is raised through (the description) establishing inferiority even of the standards of comparison for Sītā's face etc. to her faces etc.

bearing unsurpassed beauty and hence the fallacy of being too-wide is not involved. Even at this stage, question arises.

> While hearing from you (the stories of) our heroic feats that rendered the gods and demons submissive by means of winning at ease all the three worlds, the daughter of earth (i.e. Sītā) with a mind tinged with hate to her husband, would remain affectionate to me; since, the love of women is fickle due to love for assemblage of higher and higher qualities.

Here, although in fact firmly devoted to her husband, goddess Sītā is conjectured as fickle on the basis of a relation, viz., the state of being associated with fickleness that is noticed in womanhood in other cases. Yet, the figure is not Utprekṣā, since, the mere thinking, made by Rāvaṇa in favour of the occurrence in accordance with his desire, as being described, possesses no special charm. It would be unjustified to say that the term 'dharma' ('property') in the expression 'anyadharma-sambandhāt' is desired to be causing delight to the heart of connoisseures as in the case of Upamā and not merely a common property and thus the fallacy of being too wide is not involved; since, although leading to the mere possibility of fickleness etc. belonging to womanhood, it would fail to lead to the figure Upamā owing to the lack of a common property that causes delight to the heart of connoisseures, because, the fallacy of being too wide would still remain unaverted as in the following verse —

> Having definitely taken the creeper, full

of bunches, beautiful like breasts, as Sītā, Rāma ran after (that) with a desire to look at (her).

One should not argue that it is unjustified to say that the state of being used purposedly has been taken as an adjunct to 'tarka' (i.e. 'conjecture'), but here the possibility is unpurposed, because, if this be admitted, then, as the possibility noticed in the expression 'śaṃke hanūmatkathitapravṛttiḥ' also is unpurposed, the question of futility of the expression 'anyatvena', which was meant for the exclusion of that (i.e. the imagination of possibility unpurposedly applied), would arise, since 'anyatvena' means 'known as something other than that', that itself culminates in the adjunct, viz., the state of being used purposedly.

It may still be argued that this is not the definition, since, the fallacy of being too narrow is involved. Thus, where something is conjectured on the basis of a property belonging to the self (i.e. the object of comparison) only, or belonging to the other (i.e. the standard of comparison) only, it would be found too narrow, since, a part of the definition, viz., 'anyadharmasambandhāt' ('owing to the connection with something else') is not found there. For example —

By catching the mass of hair in the form of darkness, with the fingers in the form of its rays, the moon as if kisses the face of the night in which the eyes in the form of lotuses have closed.

Since those are innumerable in the dark

> (night) and rare in the moonlit, we think
> that this moon has been made by the fire
> in the form of evening with the help of
> 76 stars being intensely churned in the
> crucible in the form of the sky.

Here, in the first example, kissing by the moon has been conjectured only on the basis of the property belonging to the self, since, the catching of darkness like the mass of hair with the rays similar to fingers (has been described). In the second, the moon, as being caused by the host of stars, churned in the crucible in the form of the sky, placed in the midst of fire in the form of evening, has been imagined on the basis of the property, viz., the state of being rare and innumerable, belonging to the other only. Moreover, it would be found too-narrow (a definition) in cases of Utprekṣā pertaining to a cause, a result and a nature of the property, since, a part of the definition, namely, 'anyatvena', is not found here. For example —

> This is the very spot where searching for
> you I saw an anklet which had dropped down
> upon the ground — an anklet which kept
> silent through grief of separation, as it
> were, from your lotus-like feet.

In this example of Utprekṣā pertaining to a cause, on the basis of silence pertaining to the anklet, which is common to the grieved, grief as the cause to that (i.e. the silence) is being imagined as the (common) property on the anklet, and not the identity with the grieved; since, a suffix like 'matup' is not found after the word 'duḥkha'. Similarly,

> That the thorny region of forest caused wounds on the skin of the forehead of the (king of) Cholas, fleeing out of fear, was as if to read the letters, — what more will he suffer.

In this example of Utprekṣā pertaining to a result on the basis of causing wounds on the forehead by the trees, which is common to persons engaged in reading the decree of fate, reading of the decree of fate which as the target of the trees is that result, is being imagined as the property and not the identity with the 'dharmin' (substratum), engaged in reading the decree of fate; since, the implication of the term 'draṣṭum' does not extent upto a 'dharmin' (i.e. substratum). Again, —

> The ocean as if grinds the sandal in the form of foam with its crests of waves. The moon, having taken them, as if smears the maiden of quarters with its hands in the form of rays.

In this example of Utprekṣā pertaining to the nature of a property, on the basis of the state of being a grinder of sandle-like foam, relating to the ocean, with (its) crests of waves as hands on the bank in the form of the slope of a sandle-grinding stone and on the implied basis of turning the maidens of quarters etc. white with the hands by the moon, only the grinding and besmearing by those (respectively) are being conjectured and not the identity with the agent of those grinding and besmearing. Because, although the verbs, namely, 'pinaṣṭi' ('grinds') (and) 'limpati' ('besmears') are expressives of agents,

the connection of the agent, which is subordinate to the verb predominantly appearing, by the principle — "Verb predominantly consists in action8, would be found impossible with other words (in the sentence). This is why, while

77 citing (the hemistich) — "Darkness, as if, smears (my) limbs; the sky, as if, rains collyrium", as an example of Utprekṣā, Daṇḍin, having doubted Upamā relating to darkness and the sky as the agents of besmearing and raining (respectively), because of the mention of the term 'iva' in those examples, decried it thus —

> If the agent is considered to be the standard of comparison, subordinate to the verb as it is and thus aiming at establishing its own action, it cannot be related to any other work.

> The Creator, who had already fashioned her beautiful thighs, rounded and of a conical form, nor overlong, so much beauty had he lavished upon them, that while fashioning the rest of her frame, he took care for the loveliness that he was to create.

Here, on the basis of (the description of) spending the entire stock of loveliness which is guessed through the creation of excessively lovely thigh, the mere care of the Creator for the production of loveliness, adequate for the creation of the rest (of the body), is being conjectured and not the identity with (the agent) having such a care. (All) this is clear.

Moreover, it would be too narrow to cover the case of Utprekṣā relating to non-contextual property, since it lacks in the portion, namely, 'prakṛtam' ('contextual'). For example —

> The orb of the moon was as though,
> divested of its best parts by the Creator
> for fashioning the face of Damayantī,
> appears to be perforated in the middle
> and displaying the blue sky in the deep pit.

Here, in the expression 'kṛtamadhyavila' ('made a hole in the middle') on the basis of (the description of) possessing that, viz., spot, which has been determined as the state of bluishness of the sky noticed through the hole made in the middle by means of the figure Atiśayokti depending on the figure Kāvyaliṅga, based on the meaning of a word (viz., 'kṛtamadhyavilam'), or on the basis of the state of being made a hole in the middle, which is conjectured as the cause of the state of bluishness of the sky* having a perforated middle, determined as the spot (of the moon), the lunar orb has been conjectured as divested of (its) best parts for the fashioning of the face of Damayantī. It is not so that the face of Damayantī itself, the contextual, is conjectured to be created from the best part of the moon, collected in the said manner, because, it lacks in the connection with words as is noticed in —

> May I see her face again which is like the
> auspicious house of Cupid and as if produ-
> ced from the best parts collected from the
> heaps of digits of the newly risen moon.

One should not argue that as in the expression — "Feast a hundred Brahmins", although there is the absence of connection through words, ultimate connection of the verb is with the subordinate, leaving aside the predominant, because of the incompatibility of the relation of the number with the feast, similarly, culmination of the conjecture, namely, the state of being created by the best parts, collected from the lunar orb, should be in the face of Damayantī, which is subordinate, leaving aside the predominant factor, namely, the lunar orb; since, the non-contextual deserves no description; — because, even the description of non-contextual, in the form of the figure Aprastutapraśaṃsā can be connected with a view to add excess in the contextual. It is unjustified to say that herealso as in another example of Aprastutapraśaṃsā, namely, "indur lipta iva .....", there exists mere possibility and not the figure Utprekṣā. Because, though the figure Utprekṣā is impossible there owing to the lack of fulfilment of materials for Utprekṣā through the lack of the material causing delight to the hearts of the connoisseur,
78 the question of mixture with the figure Aprastutapraśaṃsā would arise, since, it (i.e. the material for Utprekṣā) is available here. Thus, this definition is not correct since the fallacy of being too narrow is involved; — if said so, here we say —

It is not so that the fallacy of being too-narrow is involved in the example beginning with 'hṛtasāram', since, the term 'prakṛta' means only that which is considered to be the object of description. Nor can it be said that the fallacy of being too-wide will be consequently involved in the example beginning with 'indur lipta iva',

because, although there exists, in fact, the state of other property in the description of the face of Sītā, the state of other property does not lead to the possibility of besmearing with collyrium relating to the moon, or, because the property (itself) is desired to be the cause of delight to the hearts of the connoisseur. The term 'anyatvena' means 'by another means' and (hence) it would not be too narrow to cover (the example of) Utprekṣā pertaining to cause, result (or) nature of the property. Since, the following method is followed everywhere — where another 'dharmin', (substratum) is conjectured as identified with the 'dharmin', there, the another 'dharmin' means 'another means', but where a particular property itself is conjectured as a cause, a result (or) a nature, there the very property is meant by 'another means'. Or, figure Utprekṣā has to be admitted on the basis of identification in the examples of Utprekṣā pertaining to cause, result (and) nature of the property also. Thus, in the (two) examples, beginning with — "saiṣā sthalī yatra vicinvatā tvām" (and) "colasya yad bhītipalāyitasya", which are considered to be the examples of Utprekṣā pertaining to cause and result (respectively), properties like the pangs of separation and the reading of the decree of fate, are not conjectured as pertaining to cause or result. But the silence and causing wounds etc., which are caused by motionlessness and contact with thorns, which (again) are the properties of the couple of anklets etc., those only are conjectured as identified with silence from grief and causing wounds for reading the decree of fate. It is a must that there should be an introsusception through identification of both the two types of silence. Otherwise, the conjecture

of grief etc. as the cause etc., in the ordinary silence etc., which are caused by motionlessness etc., would be improper. And the introsusception through identification of both the two types of silence etc. has been admitted by the author of Alaṃkārasarvasva, who holds that in the example beginning with 'saiṣā sthalī', it is the property of grief etc., which is conjectured as the cause of silence relating to the anklet etc. Thus, he maintains — "In Utprekṣā pertaining to a cause, the property, the cause of which relating to the contextual is conjectured, is considered to be the source of Utprekṣā and as being identical on account of introsusception". In other places also, in particular examples of Utprekṣā pertaining to cause, acceptance of introsusception of identity is found to be necessary in the portion of source. For example —

> O beautiful one ! I think that the beauty
> of the lotus attaches itself to your feet,
> on being happy at the idea that her born
> enemy, the moon, who does not tolerate her
> blossoming during the night, has had the
> pride of his beauty quickly suppressed by
> the splendour of the face of this girl with
> eyes like petals of a lotus.

Here, the attachment of the beauty of lotus to the feet, which is considered to be the result of that (i.e. the happiness), is to be termed as source to the conjecture
79 of happiness as the cause. But that is, in all aspects, not an established fact (but only a fancy on the part of the poet). Hence, there, it has to be admitted that the connection of the feet with natural beauty itself, as being introsuscepted as attached with the

beauty of the lotus, is the cause (here). Thus, since the establishment of identity is invariable in the portion implying the source, let the figure Utprekṣā rest there. It is unjustified to say that another source has to be sought for in that case, since, these are clear that the state of being in the time of separation from the lotus-like feet, is the source in the conjecture of the state of silence caused by motionlessness as the silence caused by grief and (similarly) the state of being at the time of fleeing, raising a question, namely, how much has he to suffer even after this when even being the king, he is suffering thus, (is the source) in the conjecture of causing wounds through contact with thorns as the state of causing wounds for reading the decree of fate.

This view is accepted by Daṇḍin also. As he says --

When a particular behaviour of an animate or inanimate object is fancied otherwise (by the poet), they call it Utprekṣā.

(As for example:) The elephant gets down to the pond, fatigued by the mid-day sun; I think that it is to attempt to pluck off the lotuses who are wives of the sun.

The poet describes the entering of the elephant into water for bathing, drinking and eating the tendrils by poetically conceiving the same aimed at uprooting its enemies.

Here, the action in the form of bathing in water by animate elephant, noticed in a particular manner, for

the sake of averting heat, is conjectured in a different manner, namely, the state of entering into the water due to its enimical attitude and thus this has been connected in accordance with his own definition.

This view is accepted by the author of Kāvyaprakāśikā also. He maintained the characteristic of Utprekṣā in the possibility of identity between the standard and subject of comparison following his definition — "Utprekṣā is that which consists in the probability of the object of description as being identical with a similar object"; and exemplified it with the verse beginning with "unmeṣaṃ yo mama na sahate". Hence, it is clear, that in accordance with his own definition, this was maintained that the very natural beauty of the feet was conjectured as attached to the beauty of lotus with joy of victory over his own enemy.

Similarly, in the verse beginning with "pinaṣṭīva taraṅgāgraiḥ", considered to be the examples of Utprekṣā pertaining to the nature of the property, also, the very throwing
80 etc., are conjectured as grinding etc. That the object of throwing is not mentioned, is not a fault; since, the same is justified as in the case of Atiśayokti; and since as Utprekṣā consists in introsusception, complete swallowing of the object appears to be justified there. It cannot be said that another source has to be sought for, since throwing etc., are objects of description and as such cannot be the source, because, the existence of a different source is quite apparent in the following manner — in the conjecture of throwing as grinding, accumulation of sandal-like foam at the shore, is the

source and in the conjecture of covering with rays as besmearing the maidens of quarters, rendering them white, is the source.

The author of Kāvya-prakāśikā also, who holds that in the example, beginning with "Darkness as if besmears (my limbs), the sky as if rains collyrium" covering has been conjectured as ~~been made in the form of covering and~~ besmearing, has accepted the view, viz., the conjecture of identification in the example of Utprekṣā pertaining to the nature of a property.

Similarly, in the example, "The moon, as if, kisses the face of night" and the like, the relation of the moon, and the face, in the form of the advent (of night), which is introsuscepted as the face of night, has been conjectured as kisses. In the example, beginning with "vṛttānupūrve ca", identification of carefulness has been conjectured on the careless creation of the rest of the figure. These and the like are to be understood.

The expression 'anyadharma' is not desired to be in conformity only, but in all respects like the relation of an original and its image, as in the case of the common property in the figure Upamā. Thus, for example —

> She, slightly stooped with the weight of her breasts, having worn a garment as red as the morning sun, looked like a moving creeper, full of leaves and bent with clusters of exuberant flowers.

Here, (figure Utprekṣā) is based on the introsusception drawn through a relation of an original and its image.

> I take her to be mounted on the elephant in the form of youthfulness, enchanted with (the fragrance of) lotuses in the form of gracefulness (and) the incarnation of Cupid's wealth of victory over the three worlds.

Here, the connection with another property is due to the commonness of property between the contextual and non-contextual, on the basis of introsusception drawn through the adoption of a different compound. Similarly, in the example beginning with "aṅgulībhir iva", the connection with another property, due to the commonness of property between the contextual and non-contextual, can be easily admitted on the basis of introsusception drawn through the adoption of a different syntax. Hence, the fallacy of being too narrow is not involved there. It would not be too narrow a definition in respect of the example beginning with "bhūyastarāṇi", since, the connection of another property, which is indicated by the property mentioned, stands as the source there. There, in the conjecture of being created by hosts of stars, being churned in the crucible in the form of sky in the midst of fire in the form of evening, which relates to the object (under description), namely, the moon, there is an implication of the property, namely, consisting in waxing and waning in accordance with that state of being sparse and abundant relating to the moon, on the basis of the mentioned property in the form of being sparse and abundant, relating to the stars in those particular nights.

Another speciality is this: In the expression 'anyadharmasamvandhāt', the term 'anya' means the 'Viṣayin'

(the superimposed) in the case of the figure Utprekṣā pertaining to a 'dharmin' (an object having the property), whereas in the case of Utprekṣā pertaining to a property, it means the substratum of the property of the
81 superimposed. Under the circumstances, wherever the property, turned to be the source, is not mentioned, such a property which attains the position of a possibility on account of its being related to another object and the object of superimposition as well, has to be sought for. There, in the example, — "The sky as if rains collyrium", where there has been a conjecture of the function of raining relating to the sky, the state of being covered with darkness extending upto the ground by sky, is the source common to the agent of raining collyrium. Whereas, with regard to the case of covering with darkness, where there has been a conjecture of the function of raining collyrium by sky, turning all objects pitchy dark etc. (is the common source). Similarly, in the example like — "As if the shore of ocean in the form of love", the state of being the source of agitation has to be understood as the source suggested. But where, although there exists the mention of property — as the source,but the relation of the object (of superimposition) with that or any other object with that, is not readily understood, there, sometimes, that relation has to be established by effecting identity with some property which is different from the property as the source. Somewhere (it is performed) by effecting an identity of the object (of superimposition) or the other object with substratum of that property; somewhere with both of them jointly (and) somewhere by means of denial of a different property effected by the property mentioned. There, the accomplishment of identification as the source of a different property (has to be established)

by means of the relation of an original and its image and the like, as is noticed in the accomplishment of property in Upamā. These have been shown.

Similarly, accomplishment of identification on the basis of the substratum of property belonging to the object or a different object, is achieved by means of the variety of pun or the like. Of them, an example of the accomplishment of identification of the object with the substratum of property, by means of pun, is the following one —

> I think, even the sages are attached to her; for the great Bhṛgu resorts to the mountain of her breasts (also, they resort to the precipice of the mountain of her breasts); the face is pleasant to Nārada (also, the mouth is pleasing with its various teeth), and, Vyāsa, efficient in the composition of the Mahābhārata, has recourse to her thighs (also, a broad expanse suitable for the performance of a brilliant dalliance attends her thighs).

Here, in the conjecture of attachment relating to Damayantī, on the part of the object, namely, sages like Bhṛgu, the act of resorting to her breasts, which is the
82 source here, does not belong to the object (of description), but to the slopes etc. Accomplishment of its belonging to the object (has been performed) by the punning words like Bhṛgu etc. An example (of the same) through denial, is the following one —

> Conflagration, having climed on trees on

> all directions, in the guise of Kimśuka flowers, as if surveys the schorched and unschorched portions of the big forest.

Here, climbing on trees is the source of the conjecture of the action of seeing the schorched and unschorched region of the forest which relates to the object in the form of conflagration. That also does not belong to the object but the Kimśuka flowers. Again, although there exists no climbing in its primary sense, still, the very resorting to the tree by that (conflagration) has been introsuscepted as climbing; thus, the relation to the property has been accomplished there by effecting identification of the object with the Kimśuka flowers by means of denial.

An example of effecting identification of a different property with the substratum of property, by means of pun, is the following one —

> (Having seen) the entirely pale face of this pregnant woman, I decidedly take her to be the moon which desires to enjoy the world.

Here, in the conjecture of the face as the moon, desire for enjoying the world is the source; but that does not belong to the moon in the form of a different object, although that belongs to the object. Hence, accomplishment of the property as belonging to that has to be done there by way of effecting identity of the moon with the substratum of property by means of pun in the word 'rāja'.

An example of the combination of both, namely, the accomplishment of identity of a different property with the property of source and the accomplishment of identity of the object with the substratum of that property, is the following one —

> By means of wrapping with a silken cloth
> in the form of a slough that had slipped
> through the force of pulling from the body
> of the royal serpent, Mandākinī took care
> clinging to the feet of the ocean as if
> to remove the pain that it had suffered in
> the churning.

Here, in the (example of) Utprekṣā pertaining to a result in the form of the alleviation of pain, caused by the churning of the ocean, which relates to the object in the form of Mandākinī, accomplishment of identity with coiling at the foot is the source (of that Utprekṣā) (and it has been performed) by means of pun in the description of coiling at the foot by the accomplishment of the of identity of the object or by means of denial and thus the accomplishment of the relation of the object to another property (has been effected) by both jointly.

83 Denial of another property by means of a property mentioned, has already been shown. Thus, the expression 'anyadharmasambandhāt' also invariably exists in all the examples of Utprekṣā and hence nowhere would it involve the fallacy of being too-narrow. Everything is thus congruous.

The author of Alaṃkārasarvasva has shown its division thus: Utprekṣā is of two types, namely, the

Expressed and the Suggested. The Expressed occurs in the use of particles like 'iva'; the Suggested occurs when they are not employed. Of them, the Expressed is of four types on the basis of (its pertaining to) a genus, a quality, an action and a thing, which are the non-contextuals and are going to be introsuscepted. Since, each of them are divided into two on the basis of their positive and negative nature, they are of eight varieties. On the basis of the occurrence of a quality or an action as the source in them, they are of sixteen varieties. Again, on the basis of the mention and non-mention of the source, they are of thirty-two varieties. Further, on the basis of the conjecture pertaining to a nature, a cause or a result in each of them, they are of ninety-six varieties. Of them, the conjecture pertaining to a nature only is possible with regard to a 'thing' (and) hence Utprekṣās pertaining to a cause and a result are to be excluded from that and thus it would be less by sixteen. In the division on the basis of genus etc., also, non-mention of the source in the figure Utprekṣā pertaining to a cause and a result is not possible and thus it becomes less by twenty four varieties. Thus, by exclusion, Utprekṣā pertaining to a nature is of thirty two varieties; Utprekṣās pertaining to a cause and a result are of twelve varieties each. Thus, the Expressed Utprekṣā is of fifty six varieties. The same counting is applied to the Suggested Utprekṣā also. But the distinction is this: there, even in Utprekṣā pertaining to a nature, non-mention of the cause is not possible. Thus, sixteen varieties are there with regard to Utprekṣā pertaining to a nature. Utprekṣās pertaining to a cause and a result are of, as mentioned earlier, twelve varieties each. Thus, the Suggested

Utprekṣā is of forty varieties. Thus, in total, there are ninety six varieties of Utprekṣā.

Again, having admitted the conjecture pertaining to a cause and a result, relating to a thing also, Vidyānātha, with the contention that in the group of (Utprekṣās) where the source is not mentioned, admittance of (another) variety (of Utprekṣā) relating to a quality and an action,. where the source is suggested, is like naming a son who has not taken birth at all and does not cause delight, has shown (its) varieties in another way. In the Expressed, Utprekṣā pertaining to a nature, is of twenty four varieties, since eight varieties would be decreased, because, in (Utprekṣā), where the source is not mentioned, there cannot be any consideration of the varieties pertaining to a quality or an action. Utprekṣās, pertaining to a cause and a result, are of sixteen varieties each; since, there are four varieties more which are found in the Utprekṣā pertaining to a thing, on the basis of a quality or an action as the source along with (their) positive and negative occurrence. Thus, the Expressed Utprekṣā consists of fifty-six varieties. In the Suggested Utprekṣā again, even the Utprekṣā pertaining to a nature consists of sixteen varieties. Since non-mention of the source is not possible there it would be decreased by eight varieties which are based on that. Thus, the Suggested Utprekṣā consists of forty eight varieties. Thus, in total, Utprekṣā is of a hundred and four varieties.

Now, examples with mere indication only, are being shown. An example of Utprekṣā, where the quality,

source, genus, positiveness and nature are mentioned, is the following one —

> May that moon save you; (the moon), of which the ends are curved like a newly grown lotus-stalk; which rests on the head of Śiva (lit. the enemy of Cupid), which is ruddy on account of blazing (and) which looks like a sprout unfolded by crystal-white forehead, sprinkled everyday by the water of the river Mandākinī flowing there.

Here, a genus is conjectured as the word 'aṅkura' denotes a genus. The quality, namely, the curvedness, which has been mentioned, is the source. Similarly,

84 Utprekṣā involving a genus, positiveness (and) nature, where the action has been mentioned as the source, also, has to be exemplified. An example of Utprekṣā involving a quality, positiveness (and) nature, where the action has been mentioned as the source, is the following one —

> The wax, applied to her lips for brightening the lustre of their red lac, shone forth, clinging to the border of her nether lip, eager to live on the nectar-like lip, having forsaken honey.

Here, inquisitiveness as a quality is being conjectured. The action, namely, the connection, which has been mentioned, is the source. Similarly, Utprekṣā, involving a quality, positiveness (and) nature, where the quality has been mentioned as the source, has to be exemplified.

An example of Utprekṣā involving an action, positiveness (and) nature, where the quality has been mentioned as the source, is the following one —

> Then the pair of Cakravāka birds flew away separately with their bodies reddened by the thick rays of the evening twilight as if they were smeared with the blood flowing from their hearts broken by the grief of separation.

Here, the action, namely, smearing with blood, is being conjectured. The quality, namely, the redness, which has been mentioned, is the source. Similarly, Utprekṣā involving an action, positiveness and nature, where an action has been mentioned as the source, has to be exemplified. An example of Utprekṣā involving a thing, positiveness and nature, where the action has been mentioned as the source, is the following one —

> As she thus, leaving one (king) and approaching another, was (again) forsaking the latter, — each with virtues noticed and free from blemishes — she, whose lotus-feet are worshipped by the world, spoke to her who was Lakṣmī as it were, separated from the bosom of Viṣṇu.

Here the thing is conjectured, as Padmā has to be taken as a thing on account of her oneness. The action, viz. rejection after having approached, which has been mentioned, is the source. Similarly, Utprekṣā involving a thing, positiveness and nature, where a quality has been

mentioned as the source, may be exemplified. Thus, eight varieties (of Utprekṣā) with the source mentioned, on the basis of positiveness and pertaining to the genus etc., have been established. An example of Utprekṣā involving the genus positiveness and nature, where the source has not been mentioned, is the following one —

> I know the moon to be glittering in the fresh mushroom-like stars; the mushroom, that have grown on a heap of wood having no protection from the rain and sun for long.

Here, the genus, viz. the mushroom, is being conjectured. The qualities, namely, whiteness, roundness etc., which are not mentioned, are the sources. An example of Utprekṣā involving a quality, positiveness and nature, where the source is not mentioned, is the following one —

> Here shines like a grace incarnate to
> 85 to his servants, the foremost
> of kings, who has defeated all
> the enemies.

Here, the grace as a quality is being conjectured. The state of giving plenty and that of being easy to serve etc., which has not been mentioned, is the source. An example of Utprekṣā involving an action and positiveness, where the source is not mentioned, is the following one —

> The darkness spreads over (my) limbs as it were; the sky rains collyrium as it were; the vision has become useless, like service to a wicked person.

Here, the action is conjectured. The source, namely, besmearing etc., is not mentioned. An example of Utprekṣā involving a thing and positiveness, where the source is not mentioned, is the following one —

> (Śiva), residing in whose person, Umā
> looks on the mirror at the image — as
> if it was another 'ardhanārīśvara' (Lord
> with half-female) — as if produced from
> the other halves.

Here, the thing, namely, another 'ardhanārīśvara' (Lord with half-female), produced from the other halves, is conjectured. The source, namely, the state of possession of a form of a male and a female in the other parts in the form ~~of a male and a female in the other parts in the form~~ of a reflection, has not been mentioned. The conjecture of Utprekṣā involving a thing remains uncontradicted even in the conjecture of another 'ardhanārīśvara' (i.e. Lord with half-female), since 'ardhanārīśvara' (i.e. Lord with half-female) in reality is one. Or for example —

> (The city) which appeared beautifully to
> be as though heaven reflected in the
> middle of a lake not possessed of
> water at a place (i.e. in the middle)
> owing to the reflection clearly appearing) shone clearly
> under the pretext of the moat.

Here, the thing, namely, the city of gods, is being conjectured. Excellence of beauty belonging to the city of Kuṇḍina, which has not been mentioned, is the source. Thus, the four kinds (of Utprekṣā) pertaining to the non-mention of source, have been exemplified. Eight

varieties of this (i.e. Utprekṣā), having taken into consideration the difference in the form of a quality and an action, belonging to the source, are to be understood. Similarly, Utprekṣā pertaining to the genus etc., on the basis of positiveness, is of sixteen varieties.

Or, the variety with quality and action as the source not mentioned, following the line of Vidyānātha, should not be considered. Since, such a provision, with the source not mentioned, is not applicable. For example, in the example 'vilalāsa jalāśayodare' etc., this also can be said that, here, the quality, namely, the possession of unsurpassed riches, is the source. (Or), this also (can be maintained that,) the state of possessing unsurpassed riches, is the source of the action. Thus, twelve only are the varieties. Now, Utprekṣā pertaining to nature involving negation, are being exemplified.

Thus an example of Utprekṣā involving negation of genus, quality and action, where a quality as the source has been mentioned, is the following one —

> It is only by your natural qualities that
> this body of yours appears as smeared with
> saffron, although not applied; the lower
> lip as possessing redness without the
> application of lac (and) the couple of eyes
> as possessing collyrium although not applied.

Here, the negation of genus, quality and action,
namely, the powder of saffron, lac-dye and mark of colly-
86 rium, are being conjectured. The natural
colours, namely, white, red and black, which are mentioned

are the sources. In these, action as the source also, may be exemplified. An example of Utprekṣā involving the negation of a thing, where action as the source has been mentioned, is the following one --

> Having seen your face as the full moon
> risen on earth, I see the sky as if bereft
> of the moon because of the loss of beauty.

Here, the negation of a thing, viz., the moon, has been conjectured. The action of giving up, which has been mentioned, is the source. Similarly, Utprekṣā involving the negation of a thing, where the quality has been mentioned as the source, may be exemplified. These two very verses would be the examples of Utprekṣā involving the negation of genus etc., with no mention of the source, if the fourth lines are read as 'idaṃ viśālākṣi vibhāvayāmi' ("I think, O dame with large eyes") and 'padavīm amṛtāndhasām' (".... has attained this position on account of the loss of nectar") (respectively). Thus, in the (same) manner as said before, there are sixteen or twelve varieties of Utprekṣā pertaining to nature involving negation. Thus, thirty two or twenty-four varieties of Utprekṣā pertaining to nature, have been exemplified mostly.

In these (varieties), sometimes the superimposed is introsuscepted identically. For example, 'sa vaḥ pāyād induḥ' etc. Somewhere, it i.e., the introsusception, is in the form of a relation. For example, in the verse beginning with "niveśitaṃ yāvakarāgadīptaye", the 'eagerness' (may be cited). This difference also has to be understood.

Now, Utprekṣā pertaining to a cause (is being exemplified). An example of Utprekṣā pertaining to a cause relating to genus, with the mention of quality as the source, is the following one —

> The slender body of the fawn-eyed turned pàle like the stalk of a reed by the rays slowly emitting from the (conch) Pāñcajanya in the hand of Hari who is staying in the womb.

Here, the genus, viz., the ray, has been conjectured as the cause of paleness. That paleness itself stands as the source. Similarly, Utprekṣā pertaining to a cause and a genus with an action as the source also, has to be understood. An example of Utprekṣā pertaining to a cause and a quality with action as the source is the following one —

> The bird again approached the hand, possessing bee-like rudrākṣas of Nala who was possessed of many marks of Śiva, mistaking it for a red lotus having rudrākṣa-like bees on it from a lake having a big mossy surface.

Here, the illusion of a red-lotus with regard to the action of approaching the hands of Nala, has been conjectured as the cause. That action of approaching itself is the source. In subsequent cases also, everywhere in Utprekṣā pertaining to a cause, the very fruit is the source. Similarly, Utprekṣā pertaining to a cause, relating to a quality with a quality as the source also has to

be understood. An example of Utprekṣā pertaining to a cause and an action with a quality as the source, is the following one --

> The sun has taken away, as it were, with its own thousand rays, the rays of the people, the other name of which is the eyes and this blindness is caused by that and not by darkness.

Here, to the quality, viz., the blindness, the action of taking away, is conjectured as the cause.

87 Similarly, Utprekṣā pertaining to a cause and an action, with an action as the source also, may be exemplified. An example of Utprekṣā pertaining to a cause and a thing with an action as the source, is the following one --

> The heart of that wise, who practises sacred deeds, is made holy all the time by the heavenly river flowing from the lotus-feet of Viṣṇu (lit. one who possesses infinite shapes and figures) residing in him.

Here, the thing, viz., the Ganges, is conjectured as the cause to the action of sanctification. Similarly, Utprekṣā pertaining to a cause, with quality as the source, may be exemplified. Thus, (examples of) Utprekṣā pertaining to a cause on the basis of positiveness have been examplified.

Now follow the examples (of Utprekṣā) on the basis of negation --

> That Lord, having noticed the absence of
> the sun at night and the moon at day-time,
> created the prowess and fame (of this king)
> which are manifested all the time in the
> world.

> If the sun sets, how much is the moon in
> that position ? — Definitely with this
> idea (in mind), the lotus-bed with lotuses
> closes out of disrespect.

> When the playing on lute started, the right
> breast of hers trembled as if out of failing
> to see the other (breast) which was covered
> by the expanse of the body (of the lute).

Here, in the first verse, the absence of the genus and thing relating to the sun and the moon, is being conjectured. In the second and third verses, absence of a quality and an action relating to the respect and seeing (respectively) are being conjectured. The actions of creating, closing and trembling are the sources. Similarly, Utprekṣā pertaining to a cause, on the basis of negation, where quality stands as the source, may be exemplified. Thus, Utprekṣā pertaining to a cause, comprising sixteen varieties, has been shown.

Now follow the examples of Utprekṣā pertaining to a fruit —

> Where in palaces, the beauty of faces of
> the fawn-eyed women, which are expert in
> laughing at the moon-beams, are spreading

about, the moon, as if for them, spreading
forth its rays through windows, is moving
again and again at nights.

Having gone away from your treasury, evi-
dently, gold is staying at holy places;
since, having noticed your colour, it has
assumed a colour like that.

The sun proceeded towards northern direct-
ion, the land of origin of the best of
steeds, as if to change the old horses
yoked with (his) chariot.

Evidently with a view to making a thousand
88 milky ocean and a crore of Kailāsa
mountains, Pratāparudra spread
forth (his) fame to (all the) directions.

In these verses, genus, quality, action and thing in the form of lustre of face, white complexion, changing, the milky ocean and the Kailāsa mountain respectively have been conjectured as the fruit. Actions of moving about, staying at shrine, proceeding and spreading forth are the sources. Similarly, (Utprekṣā) with quality as the source also, may be exemplified.

Examples of Utprekṣā pertaining to a fruit on the basis of negation, are the following —

Desirous of achieving similarity with your
face, the moon drowns in the ocean, defini-
tely with a view to washing off the mud in
the form of its stains.

> The shelterless women of the enemies of the king of Kaliṅga became averse to casting amorous glances towards the female deer with whom they earned friendship during their stay in the forests, as if for showing lack of enmity.

> The female Siddhas, roaming in the grove of the Himālaya, are, as if not to touch darkness, proclaiming the spread of fame of Śrīvīrarudra, (comparable to) moon-beams.

> The globe covered with dust, caused by the march of victory of King Vīrarudra, appeared as if without the sky.

In these verses, lack of mud, enmity, touch and the sky are conjectured as the fruit. Of them, the state of averseness only is a quality. Others are actions. In this way varieties (of Utprekṣā) on the basis of pertaining to quality and action, have to be exemplified. Thus, Utprekṣās, comprising sixteen varieties, pertaining to a result, have been exemplified. Here ends the group of Expressed Utprekṣās.

Now, example of Suggested Utprekṣā is being hinted at --

> Concluding from the hoverings in yonder sky of those hawks, the rays of the sun, killing the crows of darkness, that the sun is going ahunting, the moon betook himself to the west for fear of his hare being killed; while those pigeons, the stars, flew away on receiving the news.

Here, the action of going ahunting on the part of the sun, like the swoop of a falcon, is conjectured on the basis of movements of rays, spread forth by the sun, in the form of a falcon killing the crow of darkness. Thus, this is the case of Utprekṣā pertaining to the nature and action. This is one. The fear of the moon from that (i.e. the sun), is conjectured as the source to its movement to another direction. This is another Utprekṣā pertaining to a cause. It is again a case of another type of Utprekṣā pertaining to a cause, since, knowing of that (news), identified with the bewilderment on the part of the pigeon in the form of stars, has been conjectured as the cause to the lack of gleaming (of the stars) in various places. All these are suggested owing to the absence of words like 'iva'. Others too may be similarly understood by one's own self. Since, without the use of words like 'nūnam', the varieties as

89 mentioned before, can be understood. Varieties of suggested Utprekṣā have not been exemplified in full separately, since, the verses exemplified before may turn to be the examples of suggested Utprekṣā without the use of words like 'nūnam'.

Here, this is being considered — whether in suggested Utprekṣās, Utprekṣā pertaining to a nature involving a genus and a thing, are possible or not ? If it be maintained that possible (are those varitties), then those are to be exemplified with verses like the following ones —

Where the lines of stalls of Kashmira
saffron in the cosmetic boutique, in
every evening appeared like the lustres

of the setting sun as though, falling there and having no support.

Which city, which was not possible to be conquered by others and which was as inaccessible as the Phakkikā (i.e. the statement of problem of grammar) of the Commentary, composed by Phaṇī, was as if put in a circular mark round in the guise of the circular moat.

And such is the opinion of some. But the author of Alaṃkārasarvasva holds that (such varieties) are not possible. With this intention in view, this has been said by him while dividing the suggested Utprekṣā — "Generally, Utprekṣā pertaining to a nature is not possible here." Then what is the figure in these two cases according to him ? Rūpaka — is the answer.

To a person, who has offended his beloved, this is something a excellent thread of hope in the form of the body of the moon that rises at the first day of a lunar fortnight. Is this a flow of fresh nectar, or, the sickle for dispelling (lit. cutting) the darkness, or, the lotus-stalk, dropped down from the beak of an absent-minded Cakravāka bird of the heavenly Ganges, or, the duality of the arrow of Cupid.

This is why, while exemplifying Mālārūpaka by the above mentioned verse, he has admitted the figure Rūpaka even in the expression 'Svargaṅgā vimanaskā' etc. Hence,

the group of suggested Utprekṣā has to be counted leaving aside the Utprekṣā pertaining to a genus and a thing.

Another thing has to be understood. In Utprekṣā pertaining to a 'dharmin', the property conforming to the 'viṣayin' and the 'viṣaya' is the source, whereas in Utprekṣā pertaining to a 'dharma', the property conforming to the 'viṣaya' relating to the 'viṣayin' is the source. Hence, the opinion, namely, clearness is the source in the example beginning with 'uvāha yā tanulatām', is not correct; since, that property of the body as the cause of reflection, (which is) capable of drawing a probability of identity, cannot be the property of the subject of superimposition and since the very property of the subject of superimposition has been treated as the source by all who define it with the expression 'yatrānyadharmasambandhāt'. No need of further elaboration. Here we say —

90 The way of division of the superimposed as genus, quality etc., in Utprekṣā, as shown, does not lead to charm like the (division of) the object of comparison in Upamā.

In its absence (i.e. the absence of charm), figures of speech do not deserve division on the mere ground of possibility. Otherwise, its (i.e. Utprekṣā's) subject of superimposition also should be similarly divided.

The division of property also, namely, a quality or an action, does not produce charm. Since the absence of those two,

has not been taken into account, that also, as in Upamā, would suffer from deficiency.

Her eyes, as if gone within in their eagerness to see her beloved residing in her mind, could not grasp even objects resting in front of them.

Did even the ears of the fawn-eyed women who were absorbed in looking at (him), turn absent-minded, gazing with their eyes in the form of the blue lotus buds, used as ear-ornaments? Was that the reason why their ears did not hear ?

In these examples we clearly notice the state of a source in Utprekṣā, relating to the absence of a quality or an action, based on the presentation of a bright idea.

Here, in the first example, in the conjecture of being entered into the heart by the eyes for beholding the beloved residing in the heart, the lack of power to grasp external things, is the source. In the second, in the conjecture of absorption in beholding, pertaining to the organ of hearing, the absence of the action of hearing, is the source. Similarly, on the basis of absence, numerous are the examples like the following one —

Even these trees in the middle of the altars of the sages, who devote themselves to meditation in the Vīrāsana posture, appear, absorbed in (yoga)

meditation, as it were, on account of the stillness caused by the absence of breeze.

Moreover, in the sources, another variety (on the basis) of combination has to be taken into account, since, (a couple of) positiveness and the positiveness and the negation being combined attain the state of a source.

I know the white rows of swans are but the moving grains of fame of your beauty, which flying and falling, as is proper, float in all directions on the waters of rivers and pools.

Is it not right for the assembly of stars, nor proper for the night that they now refrain from looking at their consort, the moon, whose rays are on the wane ? But the moon's heart is clearly made of stone, which is clearly visible as pale and petrified. For, alas, the heart was not quickly melted even when they were separated from them.

Who can ignore the combination as the
91 source which is noticed in
these numerous examples and the like.

In the first example, in the conjecture of grains of fame, relating to the rows of swans, both the quality, viz. whiteness and the action viz. floating on water are the sources. In the second, in the conjecture of being made of stone, relating to the heart of the lord of stars,

both the positiveness, viz. appearance like stone and the negation, viz. the non-occurrence of melting are the sources. Moreover,

> This counting of sources, we consider, to be defective for the fact that even genus and thing can become a source in Utprekṣā.

> There the mountain Droṇa which looks like the lamp of that island owing to the lustre of its medicinal herbs, and is worth-seeing with the sootlike clouds resting on its summit, will give you a magic gift of herbs, affording prosperity, as obtainable by luck.

Here in the conjecture of mountain Droṇa as being a lamp, the sootlike cloud, resting on the lamp in the form of medicinal herbs grown there, is the source and thus, genus as the source is noticed (there).

> The palace whereof shines with the shining moon on the top, appears as Lord Śiva as if in proximity for protecting the devotee.

Here, in the conjecture of the palace of the demon Bāṇa as being Śiva, the moon shinning on the top, is the source. Similarly, in the following extract, in the conjecture of Vāsavadattā as made of all the planets, the ornaments etc. assuming the form of various planets by virtue of pun are the sources.

> (She appears) as made of planets by virtue of glowing ornaments (also, the sun in the form of ornaments), brilliant smile (also,

the white-rayed moon in the form of smile), crimson lip (also, Mars in the form of the lip), handsome appearance (also, Mercury in the form of appearance), heavy hips (also, Jupiter in the form of hips), white necklace (also, Venus in the form of necklace), feet with slow movement (also, Saturn in the form of her feet), bloommed lotus-like eyes (also, Ketu, in the form of her lotus-like eyes) and beauty acting as the flag of conquering the three worlds.

And thus, the genus, action and quality combined as the source, is noticed.

It would be unjustified to say that in the aforesaid examples, the connection with shinning etc., is the source and all those are nothing but qualities; since, in that case, the question of (admitting) action itself as the source with regard to the expression like 'Īdṛkṣāṃ kṣāmatāṃ gatau' (i.e. "the two have attained such a state of emaciation") would arise, taking the very connection with action viz. movement etc., as the source. It would be unjustified to say that still in the expression beginning with 'bhāsvatālaṃkāreṇa', ornaments etc., having assumed the state of the sun etc., through pun, are the sources and not the unqualified genus or a thing; because, in that case, the question of inconsistency in the division of the superimposed as the source of genus etc., also, as noticed in 'Kapālenonmuktaḥ sphaṭikadhavalenāṃkur iva' and the like, would arise, taking that the subject of conjecture is only that which is qualified by the state of a sprout, opened by forehead and not unqualified genus etc. Hence, the

four-fold division of the source also, like the superimposed, as genus etc., and again eight-fold, each being

92 divided by positiveness and negation has to be made and thus deficient is the division in question. Moreover, what has been maintained, namely, in Utprekṣā pertaining to a cause, non-mention of the source is nowhere possible, is also not convincing.

> Was his eye immersed in the nectar of her moon-like face ? Did it remain fixed between her breasts ? Did it delay in leaving her too slender waist for fear of tumbling down ?

> Here, in the subject of conjecture, viz., the cause, the sources, viz., immersion and fixing, of the result, namely, leaving the face and the breast on the part of the eyes after a long time, are not mentioned.

Had it been so one may ask — here, in the conjecture of immersion and fixing, the sources, namely, leaving the face and the breast after a long time, are not mentioned and the immersion and fixing have no eligibility to be the sources to those two. True, Still, here the figure is Utprekṣā pertaining to a cause. It is not so that Utprekṣā pertaining to a cause consists only in the conjecture of that which has eligibility to be a cause. But the mere conjecture as a cause (is desired here). For example, in the verse 'Śaiṣā sthalī yatra vicinvatā tvam' etc. Here the fifth case-ending establishes the state of the cause. Similarly, in the following example, in the conjecture of not-seeing each other as the

cause of reducing to thinness, the suffix 'śatṛ' denotes the state of a cause.

> Alas, it is a pity that the cheeks of hers,
> so fair, are reduced to this thinness as if
> not seeing each other.

> The obstructing pressure of the heavy
> breasts, closely set, was guilty as the
> heart of Damayantī could not fly away burst-
> ing under the excessive affliction of love.

Here, in the conjecture of the state of a cause of the oppression of the couple of breasts, relating to refraining from flying away of the heart by bursting under the excessive affliction of love, the term 'pratibadhnāti' ('preventing'), denoting prevention, ultimately becomes the establishing factor of the state of a cause to the abstention from flying away. In examples like this, mention of the source of the result is essential. Otherwise, syntactinal relation with the fifth case-ending etc., would be impossible. Where there is no word denoting the state of a cause with regard to even that which has the eligibility to be a cause, it is a case of an Utprekṣā pertaining to the nature.

This is why, the author of Alaṃkārasarvasva has exemplified in the following verse, the Utprekṣā pertaining to a nature even in the case of the state of being overwhelmed, the subject of conjecture, which is eligible to be a cause of trembling although there is no word for denoting the state of a cause.

> While this king after coronation, intended

to be firmly established, the kingdoms of the enemy, with their wealth looked at (by the king in question), trembled as if being overwhelmed with fear.

If so argued, the answer is no; —

Because, if this be admitted, Utprekṣā pertaining to a cause cannot be exemplified with the following
93 verse. Since, no word denoting the state of a cause relating to recalling is found (there).

Do you remember that I tied you at the wrong utterance of (my) name, or that I threw (at you) the lotus that I had wore on my ears, so that the dropping pollens injured your eye ?

Nor such an objection is desirable.

You never did an act displeasing to me; nor did I ever act against your wish; why then do you withhold your sight without a cause, to Rati, thus bewailing for you ?

(Here), the verse in question has its congruity only as a case of Utprekṣā pertaining to a cause, namely, "Is it so that you withhold your sight remembering my past misdemeanours", coming as it does after the speech just quoted (i.e. "kṛtavān asi" etc.). If an Utprekṣā pertaining to a cause is admitted on the basis of consistency of context, even in the absence of words denoting the state of a cause, then, herealso, (i.e. the verse beginning with 'magnā sudhāyām'), conjecture of immersion and fixing as the cause relating to the leaving of the face and the

breast after a long time, which has been suggested, would be justified, since, it is the fear for falling that stands as the source in the first two conjectures also by virtue of the association of the conjecture connected with the third case-ending while leaving the waist after a long time has been mentioned by word in that (conjecture). This is seen that even where the word denoting the state of a result is noticed as relating to a result, Utprekṣā pertaining to a cause has to be admitted ignoring the Utprekṣā pertaining to a result on the ground of ~~prosperity~~ propriety. For example --

> That what his heart counselled surreptitiously to you is expressed by the face, that clearly is an act quite appropriate for the friendship of the face with the moon, the friend of (flower-arrowed) Cupid, who is an enemy of him.

Here the act of friendship with the moon, a friend of Cupid, who is an enemy of the heart on the part of the face, namely, the disclosure of secret, is expressed by words, because, the word 'Sakhyanciti' which has the suffix 'ṣyañ' denoting an act, is appositional with the word 'tat' which indicates the disclosure of secret counselled by the heart. Still, here the conjecture of friendship is as a cause to the disclosure of secret counsel and not as a result of friendship relating to the disclosure of secret counsel, since, conjecture like this, namely, friendship was established with a view to the result, namely, the disclosure of secret counsel, is inconsistent, since, unlike the Utprekṣā pertaining to a cause, on the basis of a mere state of cause, Utprekṣā, pertaining to a result cannot be

executed on the basis of a mere state of an action and without any desired (end). Similarly, Utprekṣā, pertaining to a result has to be admitted ignoring the Utprekṣā pertaining to a cause, out of propriety even where words denoting the state of a cause are found in the cause. For example —

> As flowers perturbed the heart of the fair-browed girl of Vidarbha (i.e. Damayantī) by
> 94 becoming Cupid's arrows, a maiden there who was making a garland, took vengeance upon them by thursting into them the point of her needle.

Here, in (the action of) thursting, although there exists the suffix 'ktvā' denoting the state of a cause by virtue of (its) precedence, it is not the subject of conjecture as a cause to the revenge on enemy, but the very revenge on enemy is the subject of conjecture as a result, taking that thursting is meant for the revenge on enemy; Since, it is the 'asiddha' i.e. unestablished, that becomes the subject of conjecture out of an established and unestablished matter. And since, here, the conjecture of that (desired) end is to be noticed. Or for example —

> "The making of lotus blossoms is my sketching practice for making this hand of yours" — did the Creator announce this to the deer-eyed damsel by that sketching (of lotus-blossoms) on her hand ?

Here, although there exists the instrumental case-ending, namely, by the creation of lotuses and sketches on

hands, that is not conjectured as a cause to the revealing of the sketching with hands relating to the creation of lotuses by the Creator, but the very revealing, as the result, is the subject of conjecture, taking that the creation of lotuses is the sketching practice for the revealation of that. What to speak of more, out of propriety, even where there is a word denoting a cause, the state of being a result with regard to that word itself sometimes becomes admissible. For example —

> Having seen the couple of breasts of the
> slim girl, the young nodded (his) head
> as if to extirpate (his) sight, immersed
> in between the two.

Though the suffix 'śatṛ' is prescribed in the sense of a cause, here, Utpreksa pertaining to a result has to be admitted having somehow established even result as the cause, since that is the desired sense. Thus, since Utprekṣā pertaining to a cause etc., has to be admitted even ignoring the establishment of the state of a result etc, Under the circumstances, does it require any mention that propriety should be followed in the absence of a word standing against. Similarly, in this way, non-mention of the source in other cases also, has to be understood as possible. Moreover,

> As the mention as well as non-mention of
> the source exists separately, similarly,
> both combined are also found.

For example,

The Agastya tree in buds with its dark

hue, in the forest, was thought by him to be as if Rāhu (the son of Siṃhikā) vomitting the host of lunar digits which was drunk by it in the guise of the waning in the dark fortnight.

Here, in the conjecture of the Agastya tree, marked by the blooming of buds, as Rāhu, marked by the vomitting of the host of lunar digits, the source relating to noun, namely, the state of dark colour, has been mentioned whereas the source of conjecture relating to the adjunct, namely, the commonness in property between the bud and the lunar digit or the like has not been mentioned. Or for example,

O the beautiful lord Pāṇdya ! the fettered elephants in your courtyard look
95 like the mountain in the horizon as if with offence on account of giving shelter to the enemy kings.

Here, the state of being fettered, the source of conjecture of the state of being with offence, which is an adjunct, has been mentioned. The state of highness etc., as the source of conjecture of the state of a mountain, which is a noun, has not been mentioned. Or for example,

(The horse) had the dust particles raised on account of the continuous pounding of earth clinging to its feet; particles, which were as though the atomic minds of people and which came to learn the great speed.

Here, in the conjecture of the state of having the form of mind, which appear as the noun, the source has been mentioned by the expression 'aṇimāṃkitaiḥ'. In the conjecture of the adjunct to that also, contained in the expression 'adhyayanārthaṃ āgataiḥ', the source, namely, attending at the feet, has been mentioned. In the adjunct to learning, contained in the expression 'rayaprakarṣādhyayana', the source, namely, inferiority of the speed of mind to that of the horse, the subject of description, has not been mentioned. Similarly, elsewhere too, examples of the combination of the mention and non-mention of the source, has to be given. Hence, this division is deficient and unreasonable. This is why, those divisions only are charming, which, leaving aside the eight-fold division pertaining to genus etc., relating to the superimposed and the division pertaining to quality and action relating to the property, are accepted from other divisions.

In Utprekṣā pertaining to nature, cause and result, sub-divisions by other means also can be admitted. Thus, Utprekṣā pertaining to nature is of two varieties, namely, Utprekṣā without pertaining to adjunct and Utprekṣā pertaining to adjunct. Where the adjunct to the superimposed, though mentioned, does not appear as the subject of conjecture since there is no adjunct to the object of superimposition either in the form of that object of superimposition or in the form of a source to that, but that adjunct is connected with the superimposed by another way, that is known as Utprekṣā without pertaining to an adjunct. But that is Utprekṣā pertaining to an adjunct where the adjunct relating to the superimposed also appears as an object of conjecture on account of the mention of the adjunct of the object of superimposition either in the form of the object of that or in the form of the source of that.

An example of the first variety is the following one —

> The minds of the princes looking at the descendant of Kakutstha, who resembled the god of love, whose body was given back to him by Śiva, who had as it were, accepted the importunities of Rati, became hopeless of (obtaining) the princess Indumatī.

Here in the conjecture of the state of the form of Cupid, there is the source, namely, possession of the figure of Cupid. Hence is known the subject of conjecture. But the portion of the adjunct, viz., the restoration of that (body), done by the lord, pleased by the importunities of Rati, ~~done by the lord, pleased by the importunities of Rati~~, does not appear as the object of conjecture; because,
96 in that portion, either the subject of superimposition or the source-expressed or suggested, cannot be found. But the adjunct to that (i.e. restoration) can be justified as the factor responsible for giving back, relating to the superimposed, (on the basis of the idea), namely, no other person like Śukra, who (returned) the body of Kaca, schorched by demon, can return the body of Cupid, schorched by the lord, and hence the Utprekṣā does not pertain to an adjunct.

In Utprekṣā pertaining to adjunct, as in the examples like "munidrumaḥ korakito'sitadyutiḥ", "tvat-prāṅgane sundara Pāṇḍyadeva" etc., the adjunct to the superimposed appears as object of conjecture because of the mention of the object of superimposition. In the second example, it appears through the mention of the

source. Utprekṣās pertaining to cause and result are each of the two varieties by virtue of being the object of conjecture consisting in a cause and a result relating to non-established or established (objects). In examples like "Saiṣā sthalī yatra vicinvatā tvām", "Cholasya yad bhītipalāyitasya", the noneestablisheds, viz., pangs of separation, reading the decree of fate etc., have become the objects of conjecture in the form of cause and result with regard to anklet and thorny tree etc.

> How should I describe the couple of sprout-like tender feet of the slender-bodied girl, with (their) soles reddened on account of stepping on earth.

> In order to increase the tide of the ocean, how much water does the moon, I wonder, extract from moonstones, and how much from the eyes of Cakravāka maids mourning their separation from their mates !

In these examples and the like, the stepping, increase of the water etc., which are established in their own self, have become the object of conjecture in the form of cause and result. We shall show a few other varieties of this (Utprekṣā) following another means, in the section on Samāsokti.

Another variety of this (i.e. Utprekṣā) as shown by the author of Sarvasva (is this) : Somewhere it possesses pun on (the word) denoting the property, somewhere it is with a denial by virtue of the word like 'chala' ('pretext') and somewhere it possesses an approach to Upamā at the time of syntactical relation with the meaning

(of the words). The reason is this: It culminates in (the figure) Utprekṣā through the order of propriety of function on the part of the critic by virtue of implication of the meaning of the sentence involving comparison through it is touched by the figure Upamā through the mention of similarity. Now, what does the state of pun relating to the property, that has been mentioned, mean ? Does it mean that Utprekṣā is accomplished also by pun as by the property being in conformity, or it is seen also as being embellished by pun just like purity in point of properties ? In the first alternative, the division would be deficient since, the same number of division, namely, the state of being in conformity with the common property etc., that establish commonness, are possible in Utprekṣā as establishing the property as the source. Thus in "Bālenduvaktrāṇyavikāśabhāvāt" etc., the state of being in conformity is clear. For example,

> O friend, the face of the slender-bodied
> 97 girl, with the neck turned round,
> shone as it were, the lotus with
> its stalk turned round in water in the
> form of the heaps of beauty.

Here, there is a relation of a prototype and its copy. The relation like an original and its image have already been exemplified. In the second alternative, the division would be deficient, since, embellishment is seen by other figures too like the pun as by the portion relating to source. Thus, in "aṅgulībhir iva keśasañcayam" etc., figure Upamā in the portion relating to the source, is clear.

> Was it someone curious, who as though measured the belly of Damayantī by his fist, in as much as it appears as though held by his four fingers in the form of the three lines and the golden girdle (a fourth).

Here the figure (mixed) is Utprekṣā. Here, in the conjecture of the belly of Damayantī as being measured by a curious one, holding of the belly by his four fingers, which is ascertained from the conjecture of the state of his fingers, is the source (of the conjecture) of the lines (of belly) along with a girdle.

> Continuously you ascend the extremely long flight of stairs in the form of high-soaring desires of his; and the fact that he heaves heavy and profuse sighs is due to the fact of his having become identical with you through (continuous) meditation.

Here the figure (mixed) is Asaṅgati (Inconsistency). Because, here, in the conjecture of attainment of the form of Damayantī by Nala ascending by steps by Damayantī is considered as the source of heaving of sighs by Nala.

> Was it that opposing qualities gave up their contradictory nature through his fear, like enemy kings (who also gave up their dissensive activities through his fear) ? For, he who excelled the sun in lusture (ojasā mitrajit), also conquered his enemies by his power (ojasā amitrajit);

> and though he saw the things through spies (cāradṛk), he also saw them with discernment (vicāradṛk).

Here the figure (mixed) is Virodhābhāsa (Apparent Contradiction). Here, in the conjecture of giving up of the contradictory substratum relating to the opposite properties living together, namely, in Nala, by the properties which appear as mutually contradictory, is the source.

> Definitely did the slender-waisted (lit. having waist measuring a couple of atoms) maiden learn her impatience, contrary as it was to sobriety, from the flying speed of the messenger of her beloved; for that which appears immediately after something originates from it.

Here the figure (mixed) is Arthāntaranyāsa. Here, although the speed of the wings of the swan, the messenger sent by Nala, is conjectured as the cause of the impatience pertaining to Damayantī, still there the source is not the mere result of learning, but the same embellished by the figure Arthāntaranyāsa, contained in the expressions — "that which appears immediately after something, originates from it", — which is used to avert the doubt, namely, why impatience arising out of the speed of something rests somewhere else.

> Round her waist, the Creator put a blue-string in the shape of a row of hair, as if thinking, lucky like Pārvatī through

her husband, she too, would one day
present the half of her body for completion.

Here, in the portion of source, the figure is Rūpaka. These and the like are to be understood. Thus, in

98 both the ways, mention of being punned only is deficient and has to be understood as implying the other figures in addition.

What has been given as an example of Utprekṣā pertaining to nature with the state of a denial, is this:

(The river) Śiprā shines as if with loud
laughter in the guise of multitudes of
swelling foams while the playful maidens
of the city have gone to the bank, which,
(as if) laid afraid, through the encounter
among the whales.

That also should be understood as implying Utprekṣā pertaining to a cause or a result with denial. An example of Utprekṣā with denial, pertaining to cause, is the following one —

Cupid is called 'Mugdha' ('beautiful',
also 'foolish'), because of his foolish-
ness, not because of his beautiful form;
for having given his bow for the making
of your eye-brows, he became conquerable
by you at any moment with this beauty of
yours by a mere wrinkling of them.

Here in the expressed meaning of the word 'mugdha' relating to Cupid, with the denial of the state of a cause

relating to beauty, which, in fact, is the cause, the state of cause relating to foolishness, caused through giving his own bow for creating the eye-brow of Nala, is conjectured. An example of Utprekṣā with denial, pertaining to a result, is the following one —

> The elephant, heated by the sun, enters
> into the pond, definitely to oppress its
> friends, the lotuses and not to bathe;
> since, a bath of the elephant is useless.

Here, in the description of entering into the pond by the elephant, with the denial of the state of a result relating to bath, which in fact, is the result, oppression of the lotuses is conjectured here to be a result. It is unjustified to say that in Utprekṣā pertaining to nature, the denial of nature of the matter in hand, is the particular charm, and not the denial of the well-known cause and result, relating to Utprekṣā involving the cause and result, Since on the contrary, the denial of the established cause and result in the cases of Utprekṣā relating to cause and result that have been exemplified, has a reason behind it and not without reason as in the case of the denial of nature, the scope of which has been exemplified and thus herein only lies the excessive charm. Therefore, these two also are cases of Utprekṣā involving denial and thus justified is the implication. The rest deserving discussion would be discussed in the section on Samāsokti.

What has been stated, namely, in "kastūrītilakanti bhāla-phalake" etc., the figure Upamā, which has been approached, culminates in Utprekṣā out of propriety, there,

if the propriety is in the mere identification of relation to particular places like forehead with the Tilaka-mark of musk etc., then it would have culminated in Rūpaka and thus its culmination in Utprekṣā has to be admitted by admitting the propriety in the possibility of identification. Thus in the following examples and the like, even in the appearance of Rūpaka, Utprekṣā has to be understood.

> May the glances of the cowherd-women protect you; [the glances] which are the offering of blue-lotuses at the foot, fishes in the pond in the form of the navel, known as Kaustubha gem on the bosom of Murāri, necklaces of sapphire on the neck, bees over the lotus-like face (and) the plumes of peacock of the mass of hair.

Similarly, in the following examples and
99 the like, in the appearances of the figure Upamā, culmination is in Utprekṣā.

> The group of swans, the nature of which was to produce inarticulate sweet sounds, cackled on the banks, resembling the (jingling of) anklets moving the lotus like feet of Laxmī who was going away leaving that lake which was bereft of that beautiful bird.

> The vault of the Universe gleams, a primeval pavilion, serving as the abode of the worlds. The stars are like incisions made by insects on timber and emitting heaps of dust in the form of their own beams.

> Then there entered in that hermitage, a person wearing matted locks, holding a Palāśa staff and clad in skin, of a loquacious tongue, blazing with the holy light as it were, looking as an impersonation of the first stage of life.

Similarly the following examples and the like, even in the knowledge of the figure Rūpaka, culmination in that (i.e. Utprekṣā) has to be understood, since there exists the same principle of mentioning the adjuncts, adequate for the possibility of identification.

> Encircling which city, there remained a golden wall, as if the Meru mountain with its wings constituted of the thick-jewelled door-pannels, as if entreating with an embrace a sensitive lady, as it were, who had fled from his lap.

> The water, mixed with sesamum seeds and purified by faith, which offered by sons to their Manes, reached the moon being its nectar itself mingled with the hue of lunar spots; for it is the abode of the Manes.

Similarly in the following example of Apahnuti also, the same is to be found.

> This atmosphere has not originated from the sky, enlighted by expanding rays of the full moon, but this is the umbrella

> of Cupid, at present, unfolded by the
> charm of the pale twilight; -- Cupid,
> who has taken earnest steps in pacifying
> the haughtiness of the puffed up persons.

More would be considered in the section on the figure Atiśayokti.

Now the question arises : the inclusion of the suggested Utprekṣā as a figure of speech is unjustified, since, that is the suggestion of a figure. The answer is this: where figure Utprekṣā is ascertained with the mere non-mention of expressives like 'iva' with the mention of the object of superimposition, the superimposed and the source, there, as it is very clear so as to appear like an expressed one, it attains the mere state of a figure of

100 of speech. Examples have been shown. Where ~~even the~~ superimposed, which is the subject to be conjectured, is not mentioned and figure Utprekṣā is suggested either by the expressed matter or a figure of speech and hence concealed, there only it is a case of the suggestion of Utprekṣā. For example --

> Having seen in battle the warriors of
> Vīrarudra, guarded by the fortune of
> victory, the thorny trees in forest
> are dragging the hairs of the enemy-women.

Here, a conjecture, viz., (thorny trees) have their passion excited by the sight of the warrior, embraced by the fortune of victory, is suggestedby the matter, namely, dragging by the lock of hairs.

> It was on her high breasts that Nala's

> large eyes took refuge when the ocean of his passion swelled up, overflowing its shore [of patience], with water in the form of the nectar-flow of her vision in the moon-like face.

Here, in (the example of) Rūpaka, involving a part, the conjecture, namely, 'as if out of fear of drowning', is suggested. Examples may be given in a similar way in other cases also.

Here ends the section on Utprekṣā.

-: oOo :-

Now begins Atiśayokti (Hyperbole).

> That is Atiśayokti with poetic fancy as its soul, where without the mention of the object of superimposition, the superimposed is established.

Having given its definition thus they maintain its four varieties — no difference where there is difference (in reality), difference where there is no difference, no relation where there is relation (and) relation where there is no relation. Examples of these are the following —

> A lotus, (but) not in water, and on (that) lotus a blue-lotus; all these lotuses on a creeper of gold, delicate and lovely; — thus what a series of calamities is this !

Different is this wealth of beauty, and different is the uninterrupted continuity of skill (possessed by her); this girl with her eyes like lotus-petals is not an ordinary creation of the Creator.

In the creation of this woman, was the position of the creator occupied by the moon, the source of effulgence ? Or was it the love-god himself abounding in the erotic passion ? Or was it the season of spring ? How else could the ancient sage, whose sensibility had been deadened by vedic study and whose interest had been withdrawn from all objects, be able to create such a heart-ravishing body ?

101

(Her) affliction produces flow of tears; ever increasing tears are sufficient for a channel; sighs are like the osciliating flames of a kindled lamp; the body, as if, is plunged in paleness. What to speak of more, — she passes the whole night by the side of the window facing the path of yours, barring the moon-beams from entering (in the room) by her palm acting as the umbrella.

There is a denial of difference here, although there exists difference of the lotus etc., from the face etc. Difference is admitted although there exists no difference of beauty etc., (described in the verse), from the beauty etc., noticed in the world. There is a denial

of relation although there is the same in the creation of beauty by the ancient Brahmā. Again, a relation has been admitted although there is no relation of separation etc., with the production of flow of water. These are exemplified in order. Here this is being considered — does the 'non-mention' in the expression 'viṣayasyānupādānāt' mean the absence of words establishing the object of superimposition by all means or the absence of words expressive of that ? In the first case, the definition would not suit even to the example like 'kamalavanam anambhasi', Since, the words 'kamala' etc., convey by indication the face etc., which happen to be the object of superimposition. In the second case, it would be too narrow to cover the expression "The moon as if kisses the face of night" etc., which is a case of Atiśayokti, based on pun of the word 'mukha'. If it be maintained that the absence of words conveying the object of superimposition, which are different from the words expressive of the superimposed, is desired (here), then too it would be too narrow to cover the case of Atiśayokti as in "The lotus-like eyes are opened while the sun has risen" etc., where there is an introsusception of the indicated meaning with the expressed meaning of the word 'unmīlita'; since, as the word 'unmīlita' is indicative of blossoming, which happens to be the object of superimposition, a word verily different from the expressive of that (i.e. the superimposed), denote the object of superimposition. Even if it be maintained that the absence of words establishing the object of superimposition which are different from the words establishing the superimposed, is desired (here), (then also) in the following verse it would be too narrow to cover the case of Atiśayokti, based on the pun of the word 'karṇa'.

> O the hero, the distinction of your hand
> from the young sprouts of the wish-yielding
> tree is this — the one ornaments the ears,
> the other censures Karṇa (, the king).

If it be maintained that here the absence of words establishing the object of superimposition which is different from the word establishing the superimposed, is desired (here) because of the mention of the word 'karṇa' differently, even then, in the following verse it would be too-narrow to cover the case of the figure Atiśayokti in the form of introsusception of identity of the couple of pitchers with the couple of breasts:

> Did a pair of pitchers appearing on her
> chest manifest itself as a fresh present
> rendered by her (young) age, so that she,
> the slender one, having crossed the diffi-
> cult river of bashfulness, entered the
> heart of Nala.

Since, there exists the word establishing the object of superimposition, which is different from the word establishing the superimposed, by means of the
102 description of being produced from the breast. (Now), if it be argued that the absence of words establishing the object of superimposition which is different from the words establishing the superimposed, is desired as possessing the determinant property of the object of superimposition and the state of being produced from the breasts does not possess the determinant property of the object of superimposition relating to the couple of breasts for its commonness in many, then also (it would be noticed faulty).

O you with beautiful thighs, in the quest of the nature of darkness, the Vaiśeṣika doctrine seems to me to be sound. Verily it is said this system of philosophy was propounded by an owl and hence it is able to determine the essence of darkness.

In the above verse and the like, fallacy of being too-narrow wouldbe irresistible to cover the case of Atiśayokti in the form of introsusception of identity of the sight of a particular bird with the view of the Vaiśeṣikas (which is mentioned, in the following manner), — this is what is noticed in the philosophy of Ulūka, Since there exists the word establishing the object of superimposition by way of mentioning the opinion of the Vaiśeṣikas in the form of the possession of the determinant property of the object of superimposition. Moreover, it wouldbe similarly too-wide with regard to the figure Ananvaya as exemplified in the verse beginning with "rāmarāvaṇayor yuddham", Since there is the absence of the word establishing the object of superimposition which is different from the word establishing the superimposed. If it be argued that the state of an object of superimposition and the superimposed is desired here as the following — that is the object of superimposition where something is being introsuscepted as identified but that is the superimposed which is introsuscepted in that manner and thus it would not involve the said fallacy of being too wide (a definition), then also it would be difficult to avert the fallacy of being too-wide with regard to the figure Rūpaka with pun, exemplified in the verse "Vidvanmānasahaṃsa" etc. The idea, namely, in Rūpaka only the superimposition of

~~identity~~ sameness is there and in Atiśayokti there is the introsusception of identity, has been discarded while considering the definition of Rūpaka. Also it would be too wide with regard to the examples of the figure Samāsokti based on similarity.

To whom the thoughtful Citramīmāṃsā
though half-finished like Aruṇa to the
sun (or) the half-moon to (the lord)
Siva, does not bring delight ?

And here ends this text (of the Citramīmāṃsā) as available.

